THE

LABOUR MONTHLY

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

Volume 15 February, 1933 Number 2

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Notes of the Month

THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM AND THE DAILY STRUGGLE

R. P. D.

Dialectical Materialism and Natural Science

CLEMENS DUTT

The Meerut Sentences

R. PAGE ARNOT

War and the Partition of China

R. BRIDGEMAN

Imperialism and the Split in Socialism

N. LENIN

Book Reviews

Published at

7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C.1

PRICE SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ANNOUNCEMENT

THE MARCH ISSUE OF

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

will contain a number of special articles commemorating

THE 50th ANNIVERSARY

OF THE DEATH OF

KARL MARX

Order your extra copies now. For Terms see back of Contents page. Special rates to working-class organisations on application.

● **NOW READY** ●

1932 BOUND VOLUMES

OF

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

Your separate copies are far too useful and informative to lose, so why not exchange them for a bound volume in deep blue cloth with gold lettered title.

Return your set of loose copies together with 4/6 and we send you the bound volume post free. The ordinary price for this volume (XIV) is 10/6 post free.

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

7 John Street, Theobald's Road, London, W.C.1

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

VOLUME 15 FEBRUARY, 1933 NUMBER 2

Editor: R. PALME DUTT

CONTENTS

Notes of the Month - - - - Page 67
THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM AND THE DAILY STRUGGLE
By R. P. D.

Dialectical Materialism and Natural Science - „ 84
By CLEMENS DUTT

The Meerut Sentences - - - - „ 96
By R. PAGE ARNOT

War and the Partition of China - - „ 102
By R. BRIDGEMAN

How the League of Nations Works - - „ 111
By AN EYE-WITNESS

Imperialism and the Split in Socialism - - „ 116
By N. LENIN

Book Reviews - - - - - „ 126
A Typical British Viceroy - - *By* S.S.
Trade Unions in the U.S.S.R. - - *By* D.R.

Published at
7 JOHN STREET, Theobald's Road, LONDON, W.C. 1.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Labour Monthly

Editorial and Publishing Offices :
7 JOHN STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.
Telephone : HOLBORN 6656

¶ The Editor of *The Labour Monthly* invites contributions. He cannot, however, be held responsible for MSS. sent to him, or undertake to enter into correspondence regarding rejected contributions, although every endeavour will be made to return the same when a stamped and addressed envelope for that purpose is enclosed.

1932 : *Subscription Rates*
[PAID IN ADVANCE]

British Isles :

One year - 7/- Six months - 3/6

Abroad :

One year 8/- or $2.00 Six months 4/- or $1.00

American Subscription Representative :—Philip Novick, 270 Broadway, Suite 1401, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.

The Labour Monthly is also obtainable wholesale from Workers' Bookshop, 16 King Street, Covent Garden, W.C.2.

Advertisement Rates : £8 os. od. per cover page and pro rata. £5 os. od. per text page and pro rata (⅛th page minimum).

BOUND VOLUMES

Volume I	£5 os. od.	*Volume VIII*	£1 1s. od.
Volume II	£3 3s. od.	*Volume IX*	15s. 6d.
Volume III	£3 3s. od.	*Volume X*	10s. 6d.
Volume IV	£3 3s. od.	*Volume XI*	10s. 6d.
Volume V	£2 2s. od.	*Volume XII*	10s. 6d.
Volume VI	£1 10s. od.	*Volume XIII*	10s. 6d.
Volume VII	£1 1s. od.	*Volume XIV*	10s. 6d.

Loose copies of last five volumes can be exchanged for a bound volume for 4s. 6d. Single loose copies are available of almost every issue of *The Labour Monthly* since 1921.

The articles in *The Labour Monthly* are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

Problems of the Workers' Struggle—Discussions on Revolutionary Policy—Discussions and Realities—New Capitalist Ideology—Capitalist Practice—Socialism and the Immediate Struggle—Technical Lessons of the Crisis—Technique and Society—Political Key Problem—Capitalist Adaptation to Crisis—Social Democratic Adaptation to Crisis—"End Wrangling Over Pence"—Left Social Democracy Echoes Social Democracy—Opposition to Immediate Struggle—Reformist Assumptions Remain—Revolutionary Communism and Immediate Struggle — The Need To-day

AT the present stage the problems of the workers' struggle in relation to the capitalist crisis come urgently to the front. The attacks of the capitalists on all sides are rising; the workers' resistance is rising. The intensified activity of capitalist suppression against the working class is shown, not only in the significant example of the imprisonment of Tom Mann, the outstanding leader from the beginning of the modern British working-class movement (now imprisoned by his former election agent, MacDonald), but in the wholesale unexampled sentences of the National Government in Britain (421 political sentences of workers, totalling 932 months, during 1932), and in the savage Meerut sentences in India. In the same way, the breakdown of any agreed award of the Railway National Wages Board, which up to and including 1931 had hitherto operated with success as the mechanism of social peace throughout the period of post-war stabilisation, reveals the breakdown of stabilisation before the rising struggle; the unity and determination of the workers smashed the smooth functioning of the judicial mechanism of spoliation; the conflict is forced into the open. The ferment in the working class is reflected in the new activities and manœuvres of the Labour Party and trade union leaders, who now press forward in opposition rôles, endeavour

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to take up popular issues (the Tom Mann agitation, unemployment demonstrations), denounce capitalism and reforms, and call loudly for Socialism as the only policy. It is reflected no less in the new rôle of the Independent Labour Party, which breaks with the Labour Party, and announces its conversion to revolutionary policy, and similarly, like the Labour Party, denounces its reformist past and calls for a straight fight for Socialism. It is still further reflected in the process of differentiation developing within the membership of the Independent Labour Party, as of the Labour Party and trade unions, in the discussions and controversies on "revolutionary policy," in the revival of interest in Marxism, and in the closer approach of the leftward workers towards the Communist Party.

PARALLEL to the deepening struggle develops a deepening discussion within the ranks of the workers. Under the spur of the crisis and of the needs of the struggle, and of the failure of the old policies, the workers are seeking their way forward. This process is reflected, though only incompletely reflected, and through a distorting mirror, in the discussions of the Independent Labour Party left membership, which have been appearing in the LABOUR MONTHLY and elsewhere. To the special issues of these discussions and of the Independent Labour Party we shall return in the near future. But the central issue underlying all these discussions is the question of the way forward of the workers' struggle in the conditions of the capitalist crisis. To this question revolutionary policy must provide its answer, not only in terms of principle, of the abstract path to revolution, but in terms of the present concrete situation. It is abundantly clear that the most important immediate issue raised in all these discussions of left workers, of the Independent Labour Party and of the Communist Party, the most pressing issue of practical revolutionary policy in Britain to-day, is just this question of the way forward in relation to the crisis and to our revolutionary aims, *the question of the relation of the immediate daily struggle, of the fight for bread, to the revolutionary line, to the way out of the crisis, to the fight for Socialism.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The understanding of this is at the heart of revolutionary policy to-day, and underlies many of the differences that are still uncleared.

IT is impossible to survey the present situation of capitalism and the working class to-day in the fourth year of the crisis without becoming conscious of a special feature of growing contradiction which is of vital significance for the future. This is the contradiction between the ideology of all present bourgeois and social democratic discussion of the crisis on the one hand, and the realities of capitalist policy and of the class struggle on the other. In the ever-growing volume of discussion on the crisis, which has accompanied its extending course, a change in tendency has become of late increasingly noticeable. Capitalist discussion and propaganda on the crisis is making, even though tentatively, a certain change of front. The old attempts to explain the crisis in superficial terms of market fluctuations, post-war effects, debts, finance, currency, &c., begin to pass into the background under the accumulating pressure of inescapable facts. In their place the recognition is becoming universal, even in the most conservative quarters, of the existence of deeper permanent causes of the crisis, of technological causes of the crisis, which cannot be met by patching, and which raise in question the existing social-economic structure. On every side it is pointed out that the problem is a problem of plenty, of superabundance, not merely in the sense of unused stocks, but in the sense of super-abundant forces of production, which make impossible the same volume of employment, and break against the existing social-economic forms. The questions of the machine, science and invention come to the front, as if they were " new " problems.

THIS kind of analysis begins to appear widely, not merely in the socialistic press, but in the standard and semi-official capitalist press (whence it is quoted with loud applause and admiration by Social-Democracy). The organ of the City, the *Times*, in the intervals of preaching on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the necessity of economy, produces long articles on the "Economics of Glut" and the "Paradox of Plenty." The bourgeois liberal economists paint pictures of an era of unlimited abundance and leisure in the near future. The popular capitalist press in Britain and America gives streaming publicity to the distorted semi-Marxist borrowings of "technocracy." The Forty-hour Week Conference is staged at Geneva, on the initiative of the Fascist Government, for the assembled Powers—with the Forty-eight-Hour Convention unratified—to discuss solemnly the project of a universal shorter working week (effect on wages unstated) as a solution of the crisis. Social-Democracy applauds these signs of "new awakening" of capitalism (Upton Sinclair's article on technocracy, "The Machine Menace: Civilisation Awakes To It," reprinted in the *New Leader*; *Forward's* front-page and black-type reprinting of a *Times'* editorial on the same subject; Herbert Morrison's "I Welcome It" on technocracy in the *New Clarion*).

THAT is one side of the picture. But it is only one side of the picture: the expression of capitalism—on paper. Turn to the other side of the picture, to the practical policy of capitalism and the realities of the class struggle, and we are faced with a very different situation. Here, then, is no more question of Plenty, and of the Economics of Plenty. On the contrary, the whole drive is for Economy. All the forces of the government and of capitalism are directed to bringing down the wages of the workers, to bringing down unemployment relief and all standards, to cutting here and cutting there, to extracting the maximum output from the diminishing numbers of workers employed for the minimum of subsistence. Thirteen million pounds further reductions of wages are officially recorded for the year 1932. 1933 opens with the railway companies' insistence that it is impossible to pay a wage of two pounds a week, and with the preparations of the Rail Pool for driving tens of thousands of railworkers into the unemployed. It opens with the imposition of the More Looms Agreement in Lancashire, resulting in wholesale

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dismissals. On every side the workers are faced with constantly renewed attacks. This is the reality of the struggle. All the bourgeois economists' and social democratic theorists' talk of new technique and abundance has no meaning here.

THERE is here a glaring and obvious contradiction which hits every one in the face. The understanding of this contradiction is at the root of revolutionary understanding of the crisis. We have here something deeper than a simple contradiction between capitalist propaganda and practice, like the contradiction between the propaganda of peace and the active preparation of armaments and war. There is a real contradiction between the technical economic realities of the situation, which are revolutionary in their significance, and the economic necessities of capitalism, which are counter-revolutionary and strangling production and progress. The living expression of this contradiction in action is the class struggle. The working class, in fighting the capitalist attacks, is already expressing, in the first elementary form, the revolutionary answer to the crisis, and advancing to the revolutionary conquest of the crisis. To understand the connection between the basic revolutionary tasks of the crisis and the immediate class struggle, to develop consciousness in the struggle, to develop political content, to carry it forward, is the heart of revolutionary understanding and policy. The whole rôle of Social-Democracy is to conceal and blur this connection, to keep the preaching of Socialism in the abstract, to separate the basic problems of the crisis and of social reconstruction from the realities of the class struggle, and thus to rob Socialism of all meaning and in practice hand the workers over to capitalism. Social-Democracy applauds the signs of " new awakening " of capitalism and approach of a new era of abundance, but glozes over the significance of the actual policy of wage-reductions and starvation pursued by capitalism as merely the " folly " and " short-sightedness " of individual employers and politicians, who fail to understand their true interests and the larger perspectives of the new era. Left Social-Democracy is more

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

critical of the "new awakening" of capitalism; but Left Social-Democracy, also, concentrates on the abstract critique of the crisis and presentation of Socialism as the alternative while maintaining a negative, doubtful and even contemptuous attitude to the immediate class struggle as incapable of yielding results in view of the facts of the crisis. From the heights of its newly-won "revolutionary" standpoint Left Reformism looks down upon the preoccupation of Communism with the immediate struggle of the workers, and with naïve effrontery condemns it as "reformist." Thus we have the striking spectacle in which capitalist propaganda, social-democracy and left social-democracy all fix the eyes of the workers on the stars, on the coming new era, while Communism alone appears to fix them on the earth. Does this mean that Communism is limited, non-revolutionary, opportunist, reformist? On the contrary, we shall have occasion to see that it means that Communism is pursuing the only serious and consistent revolutionary policy in the present conditions of the crisis.

THE direct technical lessons of the crisis, the unconcealed bankruptcy of the existing organisation of production in face of the plain facts of the present world situation, the necessity of a new system of organisation if the resources of modern technique are to be utilised—all this is glaringly obvious to every thinking observer to-day, including to the majority of the bourgeoisie. As Engels wrote already half-a-century ago in his *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*:

> Their political and intellectual bankruptcy is scarcely any longer a secret to the bourgeoisie themselves.

And further:

> The bourgeoisie are convicted of incapacity further to manage their own social productive forces.

If this could be said already half-a-century ago, how much more so to-day? The simple observation of the facts, and the helplessness of the modern bourgeois outlook in facing them, is typically expressed by Professor Einstein:

> At a time when we are rich in consumable goods and means of production as no previous generation before us, a great part of humanity suffers severe want. Production and consumption falters

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> to an increasing degree, and confidence in public institutions has sunk as never before. It is as if the circulatory system of the whole economic organism were throughout fatally ill. Some pessimists ask: "Why should not our civilisation collapse through inner decay in a manner similar to that of the Roman Empire?"

This is the expression of the leading scientist of the bourgeois world. He sees the plain facts, as also any man in the street can see them. But they remain a mystery, an enigma, some fatal inner decay as of the Roman Empire. They remain a mystery, because he sees only the superficial facts of production and consumption, and not the living class realities which these express. The blockage appears as a mystery of "the circulatory system," and not as a plain blockage of class monopoly and mass impoverishment.

STEP by step, after the event, as always, bourgeois economics is compelled to correct itself, to adapt itself, to pick up isolated fragments from Marxism, not through scientific understanding, but through the ugly impact of facts, and therefore inevitably getting these fragments incorrectly and in wrong perspective. Only in the fourth year of the crisis the emphasis begins to turn from the surface phenomena of markets, price-levels, currency, credit, &c., to deeper questions of technique and society, of the development of the forces of production and their relation to social organisation—the most elementary questions familiar to Marxism, but scarcely yet studied, save in the most unscientific descriptive fashion, in the empirical day-to-day calculations of bourgeois economics. Questions of the machine, of science and invention, and their effects on employment and on social-economic forms (made fully clear in the most elementary form for every worker by Marx three-quarters of a century ago), now begin to be solemnly discussed as "new" problems in capitalist quarters—"new" only in the sense that the falsity of all the previous facile bourgeois theories about "alternative occupations," &c., has now been demonstrated beyond denial by experience, and Marxism is forced to the front as the only scientific theory by facts.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BUT all this beginning of an approach to the technical problems of the present era, which has now become fashionable in capitalist quarters (after the awakening from the debauch of rationalisation and Fordism), is still fully empty and useless, in so far as it does not face the class realities that are the living forms through which the technical contradictions express themselves. Certainly, modern large-scale production is ever more clearly at war with existing social-economic forms, leading to ever greater crisis and deadlock. But "the contradiction between socialised production and capitalistic appropriation manifests itself as the antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie." Here is the crux. The problem is not a problem of technique. The problem is a problem of creating the conditions which will make possible the freeing of technique for its full use. But this means ending the class ownership of the means of production, which can only be accomplished by the conquest of power by the working class. *The problem of the present crisis is, in short, not technical, but political.* All the technicians in the world can only perform an auxiliary rôle towards this cardinal task. And for this reason all the capitalist and social democratic most "daring" schemes of reorganisation are empty nonsense, since they do not face the tasks of the working class revolution. On the basis of capitalist property, the only practical policy can and must be the actual policy of renewed attacks upon the workers, driving down standards, and increasing contradictions. But this empty character applies in fact also to the Left Social-Democratic schemes, which "recognise" the necessity of revolution "in principle," but ignore and deny the tasks of the present class struggle, out of which alone the working class advance to revolution can develop.

CAPITALISM meets and accepts the new facts laid bare by the crisis, the world demonstration of technical advance under capitalism leading to wholesale unemployment and poverty, which in reality shatter all the previous theories and professions of capitalism—capitalism, nevertheless, accepts and adapts all these to serve its own

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purposes, and prepares a new ideological front. Instead of drawing the conclusion that, if the facts are so, then capitalism stands condemned and must be got rid of, it draws the conclusion that, if the facts are so, then unemployment is inevitable and must be henceforth expected and accepted on a large-scale as chronic (" technological unemployment " is the new term now in fashion, or " scrap," as the Prime Minister and former leader of the Labour Party eloquently calls those of his fellow-citizens from whom capitalism is unable to make further profit). Second, it draws the conclusion that, if the facts are so, then capitalism has demonstrated its amazing power to solve the problem of production, and there only remains a technical problem of maladjustment and distribution to be solved by suitable machinery, encouragement of spending, sales-mechanism, facilitation of exchange and trade, creation of confidence, &c., for a new era of plenty to begin. Third, it draws the conclusion that, if the facts are so, then technical advance stands thereby condemned as having gone " too fast," and the only problem is to retard it by suitable restrictive measures in the common interest. A flood of propaganda begins to be let loose on the evils of machinery and large-scale production, and on the advantages of a return to small-scale. There could be no clearer expression of decay, and of the complete reversal of the whole rôle of capitalism. All these paths and by-paths of current capitalist ideology serve the same purpose of endeavouring to draw off attention from the plain lesson to which the crisis points.

HOW, then, does Social-Democracy meet the crisis, since the crisis has delivered a no less smashing blow to the whole theory of reformism and of peaceful progress that it preached ? Once again there is a process of adaptation, which seeks to utilise the very facts of exposure in order to prepare a new ideological front. Capitalism in crisis, faced with diminishing profits and budget deficits, has no longer the same facility to grant crumbs of reforms from its surplus to keep the workers quiet ; on the contrary, it seeks to reverse the engines, to place the burdens of the crisis

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the workers, to withdraw reforms already granted, cut down benefits, and reduce social services. Social-Democracy, which was the licensed purveyor of the crumbs of reforms to the workers, had been able on this basis to present itself as the " practical " leadership of the working class, in opposition to the revolutionary phrasemongers. To-day it has to assist the reversal of this process. Such a reversal might be thought to mean the death-blow of its authority. Not yet so fast, although the undermining process is rapidly at work (the loud complaints of the Labour Party leaders over Birkenhead and Belfast that concessions to-day are only won by the Communists). On the contrary, with a sudden change of front, the Labour Party leadership now proclaims with one voice the " End of Reformism," " Farewell to Gradualism "; henceforth the policy of the Labour Party shall be " Socialism " and nothing else. At the same time, the actual programme abandons even the previous line of nationalisation, and develops the form of the " Public Corporation," *i.e.*, the present capitalist lines of rationalisation. Thus, while the actual policy moves further and further away from the remnants of socialism and even of the old reforms towards the current needs of capitalist repression against the workers, the propaganda becomes more and more noisy in its proclamations of " Socialism " and even " Marxism " (Greenwood, Cripps) and " Revolution " (Lansbury).

IN this way Social-Democracy adapts itself to the line of Capitalism in the crisis, and performs its double service, at once drawing the workers away from the actual struggle as now too petty to be worthy of their attention, and at the same time meeting their rising discontent with revolutionary-sounding phrases and every kind of left manœuvre. Typical is the article of the General Council leader, Arthur Pugh, Secretary of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation, formerly the incarnation of " practical " penny-wise trade union leadership, who now comes out with a stirring appeal to iron and steel workers to think less of the pennies and more of " vision " and " the Brotherhood of Man and the Fatherhood of God."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He writes in the *New Clarion* (January 21, 1933) under the striking title :

WE MUST END THE WAGE-SLAVE MENTALITY.
WHILE WE ARE WRANGLING ABOUT PENNIES. THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IS TAKING PLACE OVER OUR HEADS.

He gives to trade unionists the theoretically admirable advice :

> Our attitude towards trade unionism and its purpose and possibilities, and our view of life in relation to the industrial system, must cease to be that of wage-slave mentality, which can conceive no other purpose in trade union organisation than to get a little more wages or to avoid losing a little.

No more " wrangling about pennies." Beware of too much pre-occupation with sordid aims " to get a little more wages or to avoid losing a little." That is the warning that goes out from the trade union leadership to-day in face of the capitalist offensive. All in the name of the fight against " wage-slavery "! Lest it should be thought that he is inciting the iron and steel workers to the immediate overthrow of capitalism, he hastens to explain :

> It will not be accomplished by phrases and slogans about the capitalist system, as though all that will happen is that we shall wake up some fine morning and find the social millenium arrived, without any effort on our part or any attempt to understand the working of the system we condemn or any constructive attempt to effect the necessary changes.

" To understand the working of the system we condemn " ; " constructive attempt." It is sufficiently clear to anyone familiar with the type of language used that what is here meant beneath the polished phrases is capitalist reorganisation. Thus in the name of the fight against wage-slavery, the actual lead is to capitalist reorganisation and against the immediate class struggle.

AND now turn to Left Social-Democracy, to the line of the I.L.P. How does Left Social-Democracy meet the conditions created by the crisis ? The immediate fact that strikes the eye is *the extremely close resemblance in practical outcome, despite all the noisy proclamations of difference, of the new line of Left Social-Democracy to*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the new general line of Social-Democracy, i.e., of the Labour Party. Once again we have the vigorous denunciation of Reformism, of Gradualism, of the whole past record and policy. Once again we have the calls, in still more emphatic form, for Socialism, for Nothing but Socialism, for Revolution. And once again we have, under cover of these high aims, the decrying of the immediate class struggle, of the wage struggle, of the fight for pence, as "mere reformism." It is true that the same basic line is dressed out in much more picturesque and flowery language, in much more "revolutionary" and even would-be "Marxist" language. But it remains the same basic line. It is true that the I.L.P. endeavours to make a theoretical differentiation of itself from the Labour Party with an abstract acceptance of revolution and Marxism. But this is common to all Left Social-Democracy; Austro-Marxism does it much better, with a far more skilful revolutionary-Marxist-sounding programme than the still very limited parliamentary-democratic programme of the I.L.P. It is true, finally, that there are in the membership of the I.L.P. many serious militant workers who are fighting for a real change of policy, who are drawing close to Communism, who are fighting in full unity with the Communists in the daily struggle, and who have nothing in common with this line and leadership. But we are concerned here with the official line and leadership of the I.L.P. as a party, as expressed in its organ, in its programmatic utterances, and in the declarations of its leaders. That line remains still the typical line of Left Social-Democracy, performing the same objective rôle as previously under different conditions. Just as the rôle of Social-Democracy is to echo the line of capitalism and translate it into language plausible to the workers, so the rôle of Left Social-Democracy is to echo the line of Social-Democracy and translate it into language plausible to the left workers, to the workers discontented with official Social-Democracy. This task the I.L.P. leadership is performing under conditions of extreme radicalisation of the left workers and of their approach to Communism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT is important is just the tendency to opposition to the immediate class struggle (denial of its possibilities or usefulness or revolutionary significance) in the name of the higher revolutionary aims. This is the hallmark of the passive abstract revolutionism of Left Social-Democracy, which places it in practice in the same camp with Social-Democracy and with capitalism. Of course, the attempt is made to base this opposition on the most " objective " and even " Marxist " grounds. Complaint is made by the I.L.P. leaders of the " apathy " and " depression " of the workers. At another time, it is pointed out, on the eve of the weavers' strike, that " we fear a reduction of wages is now inevitable." (*New Leader*, July 1, 1932.) At another time, it is pointed out, in the best capitalist propagandist manner, that the poor capitalist simply has not the means to pay any more : " to-day he has no superfluity ; therefore there is an end of concessions " (*New Leader*, December 16, 1932). (The railway companies, who have had such difficulty to prove that with a miserable twenty-six millions pounds of profits last year, they are absolutely compelled to cut wages, should really employ some I.L.P. propagandists ; only the I.L.P. has adequately appreciated what a " cast-iron " case they have ; the railwaymen have been far less appreciative). Or again, it is pointed out with a great display of revolutionary virtue that " to concede the possibility of winning concessions under capitalism is virtually to abandon Socialism " (in which case Marx, who dealt very clearly with the rôle of the daily struggle, most signally " abandoned Socialism ")—as if the winning of a success in a partial struggle actually weakened, instead of strengthening, the consciousness, organisation and aggressiveness of the working class, and the advance to revolution.

JUST in this line of argument the basic Reformism of the I.L.P., persisting beneath the outer dress of " Crisis-Revolution," is most revealingly laid bare. It is declared (*New Leader*, December 16, 1932) :

> If we are still in the era in which we can expect a steady improvement of the workers' conditions by forcing social reforms out of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> super-profits, *then the whole case for gradualism is re-established.* Even if it is a slow business, it is obvious that the workers would always and rightly choose a long, steady, upward climb rather than the horrors and risks of revolution. You cannot lead an honest fight for better conditions under Capitalism unless you believe in gradualism and repudiate the Socialist contention that that avenue is now blocked. (Italics added.)

What a revelation of the "revolutionary Marxism" of the I.L.P.! Reformism, according to this teaching, was fully correct, so long as it was possible to win "social reforms out of super-profits." If it were only possible to-day to win "social reforms out of super-profits," then "the whole case for gradualism is re-established"; for Reformism would be "rightly" to be chosen, if only social reform were possible to-day, in preference to the "horrors and risks of revolution." Reformism was thus fully correct up to the crisis; it has only *become* incorrect since the crisis; and if Capitalism were again to recover, Reformism would again become correct. Such is the "revolutionary" outlook of the present I.L.P. On the contrary: Reformism was never the correct policy of the working class, never represented the permanent interests of the working class as a whole even in the period of the most flourishing, ascending capitalism, but always represented the sacrifice of the permanent interests of the whole class to the minute, temporary and insecure benefits of a small section. But the *struggle* for immediate demands as a stage in the developing struggle of the working class against capitalism, in the development of consciousness and organisation of the working class, in the advance to revolution, was always correct, also in the period of ascending capitalism, and is more than ever correct at the present point in the period of extreme capitalist crisis, when the smallest partial struggle rapidly raises fundamental class issues (the struggle for a few pence of unemployment relief turns into a direct fight against all the forces of the State, with enormous effects in carrying forward the revolutionising of the consciousness of the workers).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE Third Congress of the Communist International in 1921, in the Theses on Tactics, explained fully and explicitly the Communist outlook on " Partial Struggles and Partial Demands " ; and I.L.P. workers who wish to clear their views on these questions will do well to study these. The relevant section declares :

> The development of the Communist parties can only be achieved through a fighting policy. Even the smallest Communist units must not rest content with mere propaganda and agitation. In all proletarian mass organisations they must constitute the vanguard, they must teach the backward vacillating masses how to fight, by formulating practical plans for direct action, and by urging the workers to make a stand for the necessaries of life. Only in this manner will Communists be able to reveal to the masses the treacherous character of all non-Communist parties. The Communists must prove that they are able to lead in the practical struggle of the proletariat, and by promoting these conflicts, the Communists will succeed in winning over great masses of the proletariat to the struggle for the dictatorship.

Does this emphasis on " practical plans," " the practical struggle," mean teaching that any lasting improvement of the workers' conditions can be achieved within capitalism ? Of course not.

> The entire propaganda and agitation, as well as the other work of the Communist Parties, must be based on the conception that no lasting betterment of the position of the proletariat is possible under capitalism ; that the overthrow of the bourgeoisie is a pre-requisite for the achievement of such betterment.

But this understanding that only the revolution can solve the problems of the workers must not mean the abandonment of the immediate struggle.

> This conception, however, must not find expression in the abandonment of all participation in the proletarian struggle for actual and immediate necessaries of life, until such a time as the proletariat will be able to attain them through its own dictatorship.

What is important is not what capitalist industry can pay, but what the workers need and are prepared to fight for.

> What the Communist Parties have to consider is, not whether capitalist industry is able to continue to exist and compete, but rather, whether the proletariat has reached the limit of its endurance. If

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> these Communist demands are in accordance with the immediate needs of the great proletarian masses, and if they are convinced that they cannot exist without the realisation of these demands, the struggle for these demands will become an issue in the struggle for power. The alternative offered by the Communist International in place of the minimum programme of the reformists and centrists is : the struggle for the concrete needs of the proletariat, for demands which, in their application, undermine the power of the bourgeoisie, which organise the proletariat, and which form the transition to proletarian dictatorship, even if certain groups of the masses have not yet grasped the meaning of such proletarian dictatorship.

Here is the decisive difference between the revolutionary and the reformist attitude to reforms and immediate demands. For the reformist, the reform is the means to improve the conditions of the workers within capitalism and thereby diminish and reconcile the contradictions of the class struggle. For the revolutionary, the struggle for the immediate demand is the means to deepen and intensify the class struggle, to " undermine the power of the bourgeoisie " and " organise the proletariat." Thus the partial struggle leads to the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

> As the struggle for these demands embraces ever-growing masses, and as the needs clash with the needs of capitalist society, the workers will realise that capitalism must die if they are to live. The realisation of this fact is the basis of the will to fight for the dictatorship.

THE understanding of the revolutionary rôle of the present immediate partial struggles is more than ever important at the present stage. The extreme stage of the capitalist crisis, the large political issues confronting us, call urgently for revolutionary struggle, for the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship as the sole way out. But the working class, despite the ever-growing radicalising effects of the crisis, is still heavily under the influence of Social-Democracy, is not yet ready for the decisive struggle. To overthrow the influence of Social-Democracy, to prepare the consciousness and organisation of the workers, is the urgent necessity, for which the time is short. The path forward to achieve this lies through the partial struggles arising directly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out of the present crisis. Through the partial struggles the fighting front of the workers can be developed, the conflic against capitalism deepened and extended, the political consciousness of the issues awakened in wide numbers of workers, and revolutionary mass organisation built up and strengthened. But this requires the revolutionary approach to partial struggles. The partial struggle does not of itself automatically develop the revolutionary consciousness and readiness of the workers. There is a revolutionary and a reformist approach to partial struggles. The task of the revolutionary in the immediate struggle is at the same time to lead the " practical struggle," and to utilise the issues of the struggle in such a way as to deepen and extend its character and to develop political revolutionary consciousness and organisation through it. There was never more need of the correct understanding and realisation of the revolutionary rôle in the present immediate struggles. This is the decisive question at the present point ; and this is the path forward to the imminent large issues and to the revolutionary struggle for power.

R. P. D.

[*Owing to pressure of space we have been compelled to hold over various contributions to the I.L.P. "Revolutionary Policy" Discussion, etc., etc. Left I.L.P.'ers should note that the columns of* THE LABOUR MONTHLY *are still open to contributions to the I.L.P. discussion.*]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM AND NATURAL SCIENCE

By CLEMENS DUTT

PROFESSOR Hogben's comments on the review published in this journal[1] of his book entitled *The Nature of Living Matter* are especially valuable because they raise in a fairly sharp form a number of questions of considerable importance in relation to current tendencies in science. It was, indeed, particularly the purpose of the review to provoke thinking, by emphasis on the limitations of the outlook of even the best scientific research workers under capitalism, but this had necessarily to be done in so condensed a form that some of the statements were not intelligible without explanation. Therefore the opportunity for further elucidation is very valuable and the article now written by Professor Hogben provides sufficient basis for so doing without further reference to his book on *The Nature of Living Matter* or the need to argue whether the quotations made from it were or were not representative samples of the context.

In view of space limitations, it is not possible even now to deal adequately with all the points raised by Professor Hogben's statement. If the present article takes the form rather of an independent consideration of the significance of dialectical materialism for the outlook of natural science than of a controversial rejoinder to Professor Hogben's remarks, the reason is that this seems the best method of making clear these particular points and provides a background for the examination of Hogben's special conceptions.

The prime issue is involved in the Marxist contention that the only adequate scientific foundation for investigation and knowledge of nature, human history and processes of thinking is provided by the development of materialism in the form of dialectical materialism and that this has a special importance and applicability in the current basic problems of natural scientific enquiry. In contrast to this, Hogben puts forward the points, fundamentally opposed to the above, (1) that "*in praxis* the antinomy of mind and matter is resolved in the concept of *behaviour* experienced only as characteristics of matter, living or non-living," and (2) that "dialectical materialists have not yet reached agreement about the contemporary issues which interest me most as a scientist." On the

[1] *The Hesitant Materialist:* By Clemens Dutt (October, 1932, p. 649). *Materialism and the Concept of Behaviour:* By L.H. (January, 1933, p. 40).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one hand, therefore, he claims that the old ideas of materialism and idealism have been superseded and, on the other hand, he contends that dialectical materialism is not yet sufficiently developed for its adherents to be in agreement on contemporary problems.

It is necessary, therefore, first of all, to inquire if there is any definite generally acknowledged meaning to be attached to the term dialectical materialism which would give it significance in relation to basic problems and current issues of science and philosophy quite apart from the particular views expressed by individual adherents in regard to special limited problems. Since Professor Hogben has shown that his interest does extend beyond immediate questions in a restricted field of scientific research, reaching out to the widest questions of " the nature of life " the relation of science and philosophy, &c., it will be sufficient if it is possible to show that dialectical materialism does represent a consistent and fundamental outlook and method of approach of the very widest significance.

That dialectical materialism does constitute such an outlook can be clearly understood from the exposition and application of it to be found in the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin. For the sake of clarity, an attempt will be made here to draw attention to some of the most fundamental features. The starting point is the basic standpoint of materialism, the " broad distinction between materialism and idealism as Engels stated it in his own time " (which Hogben regards as " no longer relevant to our own "), viz., that the material world is primary and thought is secondary. We are faced, therefore, with an objectively existing material universe our knowledge of which depends on the criterion provided by human practice, in the sense indicated by Marx when he stated that " outside of practice the question whether human thought corresponds to objective reality is a purely scholastic question." The accumulated facts of science relate to this complex, orderly, inter-related, developing, changing universe with which we are confronted and of which we form part. In order to get to know these regularities and connections in the practical task of comprehending and dealing with the world of actuality, the experiences must be comprehended by means of theoretical thinking, in terms of conceptions and categories expressing the relations and connections between concrete phenomena. These relations between material things are no less material, objectively existing, than the things themselves although not necessarily perceptible to the organs of sense. The theoretical concepts so obtained are *abstractions*, generalisations attained by abstraction from the true, concrete, changing historical phenomena and as such are, as Marx says, of no value when separated from the real historical basis but only " assist the arrangement of the historical material."(*Die deutsche Ideologie.*) Note may also be taken of Lenin's remark that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> A network of natural phenomena confronts mankind. The savage does not separate himself from nature. The conscious thinking man does. The categories are steps of this process, steps in knowledge of the world, nodal points in the network which help in knowing it and taking possession of it.

The problem with which we are confronted is how to make these conceptions and categories an adequate reflection of the phenomena and processes themselves. Natural science, during its development in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was permeated with metaphysical and teleological conceptions. Engels, in his work (*Dialectics and Natural Science*), examined in detail in a number of scientific fields how these conceptions obtained by analysis, by formulation of abstract metaphysical views of matter, movement, space, &c., and by the fixing of boundary lines and differences as unchanging and absolute, broke down in the face of the rapid advance of empirical knowledge at the end of the eighteenth and during the first half of the nineteenth century. In every field, teleology and the idea of metaphysical forces gave way more or less completely to the study of development and changes of form and movement of matter. Natural science was forced to operate more and more with "fluid" instead of fixed categories and to take account of the transitions and connections between phenomena.

The recognition that the forcibly-fixed boundary lines and irreconciliable opposites, while they do actually occur in nature have only a relative validity and that the conceived rigidity and absolute validity of these barriers characteristic of the narrow metaphysical character of theoretical natural science, are forced upon nature by our manner of thinking, is a central feature of the dialectical conception of nature. When it is realised that the categories of our theoretical thinking must take into account the inter-relations and processes of change occurring in nature, then it will be found that the procedure of formal logic is no longer applicable for this purpose for it only represents the state of affairs obtaining where there is no movement. The Aristotelian laws of formal logic, the laws of identity, contradiction and excluded middle, partake of the character of not only laws of thinking but also objective laws holding in nature within limits, but in both cases with the restriction that they apply only where the movement is left out of account.

The development of categories of theoretical thinking which express the concrete, living connections and changes is the task of dialectical logic. Thus, we reach the well-known definition of Engel's that "dialectics is the science of the general laws of *movement* both of the external world and of human thought." In this connection, it is desirable here to lay stress on two points. The first is that dialectics is not a mere form of thinking but is something objectively occurring in nature. The second is that theoretical thinking which reflects the dialectical

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

character of natural processes must itself be subject to the same dialectic. In illustration of the last point may be quoted Lenin's remark in connection with the general acceptance in the twentieth century of the " principle of evolution " as having universal validity :

> If everything evolves, does not this also apply to the most general conceptions and categories of thinking ? If no, it would mean that thinking is not of a piece with being. If yes, then it means that there is a dialectic of conceptions and a dialectic of knowledge which has objective significance.

The science of thinking is like every other, an historical science and the laws of thought therefore do not constitute " eternal " truths fixed once for all, as is usually assumed by those who speak of the " rules of logic."

Lenin, in the course of a criticism of Hegel's *Science of Logic*, gives a detailed enumeration of the " elements of dialectics " which may be worth while reproducing here as giving some idea of the character of theoretical thinking which expresses the concreteness, inter-connections and movement in objective nature. They are as follows :

(1) *Objectivity* of observation, not examples, not unrepresentative forms (Abschweifungen) but the thing in itself.

(2) Totality of the manifold *relations* of the thing to others.

(3) The development of the thing or of the phenomenon, its own movement, own life.

(4) The inner contradictory *tendencies* (*and* sides) in the thing.

(5) The thing (appearance) as sum and *unity of opposites*.

(6) The *struggle* or unfolding of the opposites.

(7) The union of analysis and synthesis. The splitting up into the separate parts and the totality, summation of these parts together.

(8) The relations (of the thing or appearance) not only manifold but general, universal. Each thing (appearance, process, etc.) is connected with *every other*.

(9) Not only unity of opposites but *transitions* of *each* determination, each quality, each feature, each side, each property in *every* other.

(10) An infinite process of revealing of *new* sides, relations, etc.

(11) An infinite process of *deepening* of knowledge of the thing, appearance, process, etc., by men ; from appearance to essence and from less deep to deeper essence.

(12) From co-existence to causality and from one form of connection and reciprocal dependence to another deeper and more general.

(13) The repetition of certain features, properties, etc., of the lower stage in the higher.

(14) Apparent return to the old (negation of the negation).

(15) The struggle of content with form and vice-versa. The throwing off of the form, transformation of the content.

(16) *Passing* of quantity into quality and *vice-versa*.

(15 and 16 are examples of 9.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We cannot dwell here on the significance of these expressions. The underlying idea, however, should be clear. Concepts, which reflect the concrete interconnections and changes in the objective world must reflect both the unity and the contradictory mutually exclusive tendencies in this unity resulting from the interconnections and changes, in all phenomena and processes of nature. The emphasis on this as the essential character of materialist dialectic can be noted in all the writings of Lenin.

Materialist dialectic constitutes a methodology of knowledge, a theory of cognition based on praxis for acquaintance with reality. But it is by no means merely epistemological as Hogben concludes in his article in *Psyche* referred to in his statement. With its methodological standpoint it makes an approach to reality which provides a definite world outlook or philosophy. This world outlook is not a finished system in the sense of the previous systems of philosophy, but a developing system expressing the interconnectedness of knowledge at a given stage of development of scientific inquiry.

Is this "scholasticism," metaphysical abracadabra or philosophical brain-weaving? The natural scientist who is distrustful of anything savouring of "philosophy" is inclined to regard the foreign-sounding term "dialectical materialism" as inevitably partaking of this nature. He gets the idea also that it is some metaphysical formula which is put forward by Communists as a supposed master key for solving all the problems of science. He prefers to stick to natural science, as he understands it, as providing sufficient for his needs in the way of philosophy. Hogben, also, in his article in *Psyche*, makes merry over the "peculiarities of verbiage and historical associations which make it well nigh impossible for an Englishman with a materialistic bias to extract any germs of intelligible meaning from the available writings of Communist philosophers." In particular he scoffs at the apparent reliance on the mystifying jargon of Hegel, remarking:

> Most philosophical treatises contain a good deal of rubbish together with a certain amount of sound sense, for those who are prepared to dig for it. It is not necessary to turn any philosopher through a hundred and eighty degrees to find either the one or the other.

Incidentally, this article abounds in naïvetés such as saying that Marx, instead of relying on Hegel, could have got the same idea from Buckle or Guizot, showing that he is ignorant both of what Marx got from Hegel and of Marx's study of his predecessors and contemporaries, for instance, Marx's article on Guizot written as early as 1849.

We mention these things in connection with the natural scientist's scorn of philosophy because the two things have a certain point in common in connection with what there is to be derived from the study

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of philosophy. It is necessary to insist, firstly, that, as Engels pointed out, natural scientists who imagine that they are emancipating themselves from philosophy usually became the slaves of the worst vulgarised relics of the most reactionary philosophical systems. In the second place, we must emphasise again that the science of thinking is like every other an historical science and that therefore philosophy is not purely speculative imagination but, at the same time as being an ideology in this sense and reflecting the material conditions in society, is also a development of the science of knowledge. An acquaintance with the historical development of human thinking, with the historical development of conceptions expressing in the most general form the interconnections of the external world, is necessary for natural science in order for it to get a measure of its own theories. As Engels stated, " precisely by learning to appropriate the results of the thousand-and-a-half years of the development of philosophy, will natural science get rid of every isolated natural philosophy standing outside and above it and also of its own narrow method of thinking derived from English empiricism."

In this respect, dialectical materialism represents the scientific outcome of philosophy. A condensed account of the nature of dialectical materialism as a scientific approach for knowledge of the world has been given above particularly in order to bring it into relation with scientific thinking and in order to bring out the contrast with metaphysical materialism which remains static and is unable to reflect processes or supply an adequate theory of cognition. Of course, this does not mean that dialectical materialism is a magical formula for solving or abolishing the immediate problems of scientific inquiry in each restricted field. But it does indicate lines of approach and helps to find a way out of the morass of idealist and religious explanations and bewildered contradictions resulting from the attempt to handle new facts and new problems with metaphysical undialectical methods of thinking. For a clear indication of its fruitfulness in this respect, reference need only be made to Lenin's treatment of the crisis in theroretical physics dealing with tendencies that only became generally recognised at a period much after his writing. For special reasons, referred to below, bound up with the development of scientific ideology, the conceptions of dialectical materialism are not acceptable and cannot be acceptable in full to bourgeois natural scientists. Consequently, religious and idealist tendencies become more pronounced since the capitalist world passes more and more into decay and crisis while new discoveries bring basic conceptions more and more into question and the way forward through dialectical materialism is barred. Hence, the crisis apparent in physics spreads to biology and other fields of science.

Where do the views represented by Hogben stand in relation to these questions ? Is the distinction he makes between the " public " field of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge and the " private " field of sentiment consistent with materialism and is the antinomy of mind and matter " resolved " or given a " new orientation " because the praxis of investigation lies in the " material framework of behaviour " ? Hogben would answer yes to both of these questions but not many would agree with him. In his article in the LABOUR MONTHLY he does not explicitly reiterate the Machist views noted in the *Nature of Living Matter*, but his remarks do not dispose of the characterisation of the " publicist " standpoint given in the review. He would regard this standpoint as an out-and-out materialist one because in effect he regards consciousness as of no account for scientific knowledge except in so far as it can be investigated by external methods as behaviour. Yet, at the same time, he has himself stated (*Psyche*, April, 1931) that " the outlook which I have ventured to call the *publicist* standpoint is not materialistic in the scholastic sense since it does not presume an irreducible concept of matter." If this does not mean that materialism is only a convenience for practical investigation then words have no meaning.

Further, what is the significance of the " private " world of sensations, emotions and sentiments ? In the review we said that it allows a loophole for religion on the ground that it is a " private " matter. Hogben retorts somewhat hotly that " my views allow no place for religious belief within the framework of knowledge." He is able to say so because his private world is kept in rigid separation and is apparently cut off from and does not form part of nature in the most general sense. The general view adopted by most people of this distinction of public and private is that it means that when he is occupied with scientific research he is a materialist but " he keeps another part of his mind furnished with æsthetic and religious ideas to which he retires from time to time for consolation." (I quote from a book review by G. P. Wells, which mentions him by name along with Dr. J. Needham as adopting this attitude.)

The basis of the distinction between " private " and " public " is nothing more than the distinction between subjective and objective taken undialectically as rigid opposites. In the sphere of sensation, the subjective side is separated as a private affair with which science has no concern. In the sphere of consciousness in general, certain views, such as those " which individuals entertain under the influence of alcohol or love," and which are apparently distinguished by not being amenable to public discourse or demonstration, are separated from others. This antithesis is misleading because in both kinds of views we are dealing with ideology. Scientific thought is also ideology, although the process of knowledge brings a closer and closer approximation of scientific concepts to the objects they describe. A " private " view of the genetic inferiority of the lower classes is as much an ideology as the " public "

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

view of a Ptolemaic universe though both are inadequate as a reflection of reality.

Hogben lays stress on the importance of communicability in the acquirement of " public " knowledge. He even states (*Psyche*, April, 1931) that " philosophers have never been able to reach agreement concerning the nature of reality because they have never faced the dilemma arising out of the process of communication." As a matter of fact his remarks in this connection are really not new. Feuerbach, himself, whose materialism was so destructively criticised by Marx and Engels dwelt on this subject again and again. In the *Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Philosophie* he points out at great length the significance of speech in the realisation of the connection between " I " and " You " and that " demonstration " in philosophy is not to be found in the relation of the thinker to himself but in the relation of the thinker to others. Marx also (see *Die deutsche Ideologie*) in his remarks on the factor of consciousness in history has also some interesting notes on the place of speech as " das praktische auch fuer andere Menschen existierende, also auch fuer mich selbst existierende wirkliche Bewusstsein" (" the practical, real consciousness, as existing also for other human beings and therefore for me as well.")

The distinction of public and private worlds arises in the first place from a certain tendency in modern scientific research in biology and psychology. This is the tendency of " behaviourism," which seeks to extend the advances made as a result of the study of animal and plant reactions in terms of stimuli and responses by the analysis of conscious behaviour in the same way. It is necessary to distinguish very clearly between behaviourism as a scientific weapon of research in particular cases and behaviourism as a philosophy which ascribes universal and exclusive validity to this method of approach. It is precisely this exclusive emphasis on behaviour as a material external phenomenon and the only thing susceptible to scientific investigation which reveals the one-sided non-dialectical character of this view. Hogben finds that " the antinomy of mind and matter is resolved in the concept of behaviour," that " the social activity of advancing knowledge is only concerned with " investigating aspects of behaviour." He has even called Marxism a " behaviourist interpretation of history." For him the criterion of social praxis as a test of theory, as determining whether human thought corresponds to objective reality is comprised in the study of external behaviour.

This exclusive emphasis resulting from concentration on experimental efforts to analyse life-processes, including those involving consciousness, into terms of displacement of matter and chemical and physical reactions, is a typical example of " mechanical " metaphysical materialism. The metaphysical limitation of thinking makes the contradictions of object

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and subject, of consciousness and matter, of life and non-life, into absolutes which must be either unbridgeably separate or absolutely identical instead of seeing the relation of unity containing both identity and difference. Thus, for the behaviourist, the subjective side, the psychical side, simply ceases to exist, leading to a denial of the characteristic specific character of consciousness. Engels remarks "we will certainly some day experimentally 'reduce' thinking to molecular and chemical movements in the brain, but does this exhaust the essence of thinking?" Only a synthesis of the objective and subjective sides can give a true picture.

Hogben disclaims any intention of putting forward "publicism" as an alternative view to dialectical materialism. His modesty is reasonable for no such opposition could be possible. More important is the analysis of the philosophy of behaviourism which we have described as a typical form of mechanical materialism. Hogben insists that he never dreamt of asserting that all movement is mechanical and that he uses the word machine as Engels used it and not as "transliterated from the writings of contemporary Russian writers." He is in error here because it is precisely Engels who gave a clear characterisation of "mechanical materialism" under this wording as contrasted with dialectical materialism. Since there seems to be some doubt on the meaning of the term "movement" as used by Marx and Engels in this connection, it may be worth while to quote a few paragraphs from Engels' *Dialectics of Nature*, and particularly from the note entitled *On the Mechanical Conception of Nature*.

> Movement, considered as a mode of existence of matter, as an internal attribute inherent in matter, embraces all changes taking place in the universe. This process begins with simple displacement in space and ends with thinking.
>
> Among natural scientists, movement is always understood as mechanical movement, change of place. This was a legacy from the pre-chemical eighteenth century and considerably hindered a clear understanding of things. Movement in application to matter is change in general. From this misunderstanding is derived the endeavour to reduce everything to mechanical movement—by which the special character of the other forms is blurred. This does not at all deny that each of the higher forms of movement is always and compulsorily connected with real mechanical (external or molecular) movement, just as the higher forms of movement produce at the same time also the other forms of movement. Chemical action is impossible without changes of temperature and electricity. Organic life is impossible without mechanical, molecular, chemical, thermal, electrical and other changes. But the presence of these accessory forms does not exhaust the essence of the chief form in each case.
>
> Movement is not merely change of place, in the super-mechanical spheres it is also change of quality. Thinking is also movement.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> The discovery that heat is a molecular movement was epoch-making. But if I have nothing further to say about heat than that it is a certain displacement of the molecule, I had better keep silent.

Hogben repudiates the "naïvely mechanistic view that chemico-physical laws are the only ones," but as a result of the "praxis of investigation" he reduces life and consciousness to the material frame-work of external behaviour characterised as a receptivity and co-ordination. Consequently the behaviourist view, setting aside the specific features of organic life, reducing both life and matter to external behaviour, can only regard the view that life represents a new synthesis (and conscious life a further higher stage of the same), a new whole with new laws which cannot be exhausted by investigation of the parts, as incomprehensible or vitalistic. It is reinforced in this attitude because the variety of vitalism termed "holism" also talks of the "whole," though, of course, its approach is an entirely incorrect, non-dialectical one. Presumably it is on this account that Hogben describes the views of B. Zavadovsky as "the higher holism." Nevertheless there is a real question of the "whole" in relation to that cardinal feature of dialectical thinking which demands consideration of each phenomenon with its specific peculiarities. But holism does not cease any the less to be vitalism and a variety of idealism because of its emphasis on the special qualities of the "whole," because it makes this specificity into an absolute excluding connection and transition. Nor does the view of dialectical materialism cease to be materialist because it takes these specificities into account. Hogben has some rather patronising remarks on what is in accord with the "historical emphasis of Engels," but the fact that his writings have such a bearing on current controversies in scientific outlook does not justify this condescension.

The quotations given here from Engels could well have been multiplied because the bulk of scientific workers in England even among those who are inclined to support Marxism as a scientific reading of social development are profoundly unacquainted with dialectical materialism as its scientific basis, dealing with both content and form of the laws relating to physical nature, history and thinking. Engels again and again by illustrations from scientific fields indicated the dialectical approach to questions of natural science, again and again illustrating the main features of dialectical thinking, the necessity of combining synthesis and analysis, of taking into account the origin of new qualities at each stage, of seeing the dialectical relation of the whole and the parts of which it is composed in each phenomenon, &c. The last point, which Hogben also, apparently, does not understand, is only another expression of the same question as whether all movement can be reduced to physics and chemistry, of the dialectical law of the passing of quantity into quality, &c. We will give two more quotations from Engels dealing with biology,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first as a clear expression of his difference from vitalism and the second relating to the organism as a whole. Referring to the idea of a " life force," Engels says :

> If thereby is meant that the form of movement in the organic body is different from the mechanical, physical, chemical form, containing all of them in itself raised to a higher stage, then this manner of expression is a rotten one, especially because the force appears here as something blown into the organism from outside, separable from it, not inherent in it and consequently this life force has been the last refuge of all supernaturalists.
>
> If chemistry succeeds in preparing . . . protoplasm—in the definite or rather indefinite form in which it potentially includes in itself all other forms of protein (by which it is not necessary to assume that there is only one kind of protoplasm)—then the dialectical transition is also actually accomplished, *i.e.*, completely . . . Physiology is, of course, the physics and especially the chemistry of the living body, but therewith it ceases to be specially chemistry ; on the one hand it limits its sphere, on the other hand, however, it raises itself therein to a higher level.
>
> For the organism is certainly a higher unity, combining mechanics, physics and chemistry to one whole, where the trinity is not more to be separated.

If these statements are construed as support of vitalism or holism, it is only because those who do so are unacquainted with the basis and nature of dialectical materialism. Hogben protests against the raising of " threadbare issues which the younger generation of scientific workers are no longer called upon to face." The fact of the matter is that this younger generation is in many ways more ignorant and more exposed to corruption than in Engels' own time. The vulgar materialism of Buchner, &c., which Marx and Engels attacked as the inadequate mechanical materialist view of the practical scientist trying to dispense with philosophy, has given place to an increasing degree to the wholesale corruption of Machism in innumerable shades, the diverse varieties of " physical " idealism, the spread of vitalistic theories, &c., &c. Each isolated line of investigation is made the basis of an idealist or mechanist philosophy, as in the views based on the electron theory, &c., indeterminism, mathematical formalism, Freudism, behaviourism, reflexology, &c. As Lenin says in reference to the forms of Machism, each comes forward with his own little system and his own terminology, each tries in his own way to paint idealism as the " realism " of the natural scientist.

In regard to the relation of natural science to historical materialism, Hogben is inclined to over-simplify by laying stress only on the way in which the *direction* of inquiry is determined by the productive forces of a social epoch and on the restriction of the field of inquiry by the social prejudices and affiliations of the observer. He makes it appear as if the views resulting from the latter are to be termed " lack of science,"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

falling into his " private " field, while scientific theory generally does not involve a social political outlook. Thus, also, he says :

> All scientists are materialists when they are getting on with their job. Eddington is an idealist when he is delivering lectures in support of religion.

This over-simplification makes scientific theory in general something standing above the class struggle. But social conditions determine more than the direction of inquiry. Scientific theory, and also philosophy, is ideology, its general concepts and principles reflect, of course in a very indirect way, material conditions and social relations. It is not merely fields like eugenics and race theory which are permeated by class prejudice. In a wider sense, the character of scientific theory in a particular society reflects the existing social relations. A simple example is the way in which the principle of gradual evolution characterised bourgeois science in the progressive period of capitalist growth during the early part of the nineteenth century.

Eddington is certainly not only an idealist when he is directly preaching religion. His philosophical conceptions, intimately bound up with his whole line of scientific investigation, are rooted in idealism. The struggle of philosophical tendencies underlying the progress of scientific inquiry indirectly reflects the material conditions and class struggle in bourgeois society. The struggle of materialism and idealism is a reflection of the class struggle which is fought out in the most abstract philosophical field. It need only be pointed out that materialism has always characterised the rising progressive class.

In regard to this fundamental philosophical struggle, the viewpoint of dialectical materialism represents the class theory of the proletariat. It is a view-point which necessarily comes into conflict with the representatives of contemporary bourgeois science, with the ideology of classes hostile to the proletariat. Bourgeois science and bourgeois philosophy represents an important prop of decaying capitalism, an instrument for sowing confusion and demoralisation, a basic ideological buttress for reaction. The task of Marxists in this field is, as Lenin emphasised, to conduct an irreconciliable struggle against idealism in general and all its manifestations in natural science, to show the class nature of the groupings and tendencies in philosophy and natural science, to fight for the purity of Marxist theory against mechanist distortions and conciliations to idealism and to evaluate the positive achievements of bourgeois science on the basis of dialectical materialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MEERUT SENTENCES

By R. PAGE ARNOT

THE Meerut prisoners have been sentenced. After nearly four years in the stifling jail of Meerut, held without bail and tried without jury, they receive sentences of transportation for life, for twelve years, for ten years.

What Devil's Island meant in the calendar of French Imperialism, what northern-most Siberia meant in the record of the Tsardom, that transportation has meant in the annals of British India. The penal settlements, and of these the Andaman Islands are the most used and the best known, are a bye-word for the horrors inflicted on their inmates, fever-ridden swamps, where disease and death commute the government sentences of long-term imprisonment.

These men had dared to help in the organisation of trade unions, they had dared to lead mass strikes and to develop the class character of the workers' struggle in India. Through their efforts and through the lessons of the strike they led, the Indian workers were rapidly overcoming the weaknesses of the earlier period and as a consequence were growing increasingly conscious of themselves as a class, and had taken the first steps to independent struggle and leadership of the whole struggle of the Indian masses.

For this the vengeance of Imperialism falls upon them in this series of savage sentences :

> Muzaffar Ahmad, Vice-President of the All-India Trade Union Congress, already sentenced to four years' imprisonment in the Cawnpore conspiracy trial of 1924, is sentenced to transportation for life.
>
> Philip Spratt, executive member of the All-India Trade Union Congress, active in trade union work and in the co-operative movement when in England, is sentenced to transportation for twelve years.
>
> S. V. Ghate, Vice-President of the Bombay Municipal Workers' Union, and in 1927 appointed Assistant Secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress—transportation for twelve years.
>
> K. N. Joglekar, organising secretary, G.I.P. Railwaymen's Union—transportation for twelve years.
>
> R. S. Nimbkar, President Bombay Oil Co.'s Employees Union, Secretary Bombay Trades Council—transportation for twelve years.
>
> S. A. Dange, General Secretary of the Girni Kamgar Union (which lead the six months' Bombay cotton strike of 1928), and Assistant Secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress—transportation for twelve years.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

B. F. Bradley, formerly of the London District Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, member of the Executive Council of the Girni Kamgar Union, and Treasurer of the joint strike committee during the Bombay cotton strike—transportation for ten years.

S. S. Mirajkar, Secretary of the British India Steam Navigation Co. Staff Union—transportation for ten years.

S. Usmani, delegate to the All-India Trade Union Congress, previously sentenced in the 1924 Cawnpore trial—transportation for ten years.

P. C. Joshi, Editor of Kranti Kari and Secretary of United Provinces Workers' and Peasants' Party—transportation for seven years.

D. Goswami, Organiser of the Bengal Jute Workers' Union—seven years' transportation.

Abdul Majid, left India to fight for the Khilafat in 1920, and visited Russia—seven years' transportation.

G. M. Adhikari, a doctor of engineering, M. G. Desai, an Indian journalist; S. S. Josh, president of the first All-India Workers and Peasants' Party in December, 1928; A. Prasad, all prominent workers in the Indian Labour Movement—transportation for five years.

Those who received four years' rigorous imprisonment were: G. Chakravarty, leader of the Kharagpur Railway strike, official of the East India Railway Union; R. R. Mitra, General Secretary of the Bengal Jute Workers' Union; Gopal Basak, official of the Bengal Textile Union; Lester Hutchinson, Editor of the *New Spark*, after the arrest of the others elected to an official position in the Girni Kamgar Union; S. H. Jhabwalla, General Secretary of the G.I.P. Railwaymen's Union (with 41,000 members); K. N. Sehgal, member of the All-India Congress Committee.

Those sentenced to three years rigorous imprisonment were: S. Huda, Secretary of the Transport Workers Union of Bengal; A. A. Alwe, President of the Girni Kamgar Union; R. Kasle, official of the Girni Kamgar Union; Gourakshanker, member of the Workers and Peasants Party; L. R. Khadam, prominent worker in the Labour Movement.

Three were acquitted, while in the case of another, D. R. Thengdi, pioneer of the Indian Trade Union Movement and a veteran Nationalist, British imperialism was cheated of its victim by the old man's death in prison.

When the news of these dreadful sentences was received in Bombay, the Girni Kamgar Union called a strike in protest. It was a sign that the cotton workers of Bombay, who get neither insurance benefit nor P.A.C. relief, for whom to strike means to face starvation, understood very well that the right of trade union organisation is at stake.

The issue is nothing less than this, as indeed is indicated by the list of who the prisoners are, whether the capitalists are to be allowed to root out trade unionism in India.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This is not how the prosecution put it. They charged the prisoners, in the portentous language of the Indian Penal Code, that they conspired

to deprive the King-Emperor of the Sovereignty of British India.

This was accompanied by a long rigmarole about the Communist International, which blossomed out in the speech of the prosecuting counsel into the statement that the object of the accused " was, in effect, to substitute for the Government of His Majesty, the Government of Mr. Stalin, as he is now called."

But in the whole three years and ten months of the trial, from arrest to sentence, not a single overt act, which could deprive the King-Emperor of his Sovereignty, could be proved against them. Their " offence " was to have stimulated, encouraged and led the fight against the terrible oppressions and poverty imposed by British Imperialism upon the toiling masses of India. This is " conspiracy against the King."

On the other hand, for the 1928 cotton strike alone the prosecution produced *seven hundred* of the usual garbled police reports of speeches, to prove the " incitement of antagonism between Capital and Labour."

That is to say, the prisoners were sentenced for doing just what every fighting trade unionist in this country is found doing during a strike, and for saying just what is daily said in our trade union branches. The Meerut trial therefore is in the first place an attack on the workers' right of trade union organisation. The sentences strike at the root of trade unionism. The international working class, and above all, the British working class, is bound to fight against these sentences and not to cease the struggle until the sentences have been cancelled and the prisoners released.

Trade unionism in India in the real sense begins with the Meerut prisoners. The name, trade union, had not existed before 1918, and the meagre trade unions that grew up after that date, were vessels without contents ; not trade union organisations, but trade union offices, in which sat middle-class philanthropists and lawyers, generals without an army and without an enemy. In a word, this trade union movement in name only, tolerated by the government as harmless and even useful, became the prey of every sort of adventurer and opportunist who used it as a jumping-off ground for a seat in the legislative assembly or a post under the government.

The Meerut prisoners brought life and fight into these unions, increased their membership and organised the trade union movement in trades hitherto unorganised. The great strikes at the end of the war had thrown up forms of trade union organisation which were little more than strike committees and these had vanished like the transient organisations of the early strike movement in Great Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Meerut trial and sentences represent therefore the attempt of British Imperialism to strangle at birth a great historical working-class movement, in a country whose population comprises one-sixth of mankind.

British imperialism has its reasons for this. Indian trade unions have to protect workers against the most miserable conditions, of wages (1d. an hour), hours (limited in 1922 to a 60-hour week), and general working conditions. If Marx could tell how the millocracy of England used up three generations of cotton operatives in one lifetime, an even worse tale must be told in India during the " beneficent " rule of the sahibs, when the expectation of life has fallen within a generation from 30 to 22, or less than half the average expectation of life in England.

The fight of an organised Indian working class against such conditions as these would threaten the very basis of Imperialism, the super-profits on which the British capitalists fatten.

The Indian working class could not be bribed as were sections of the English working class in the later nineteenth century by crumbs from the rich man's banquet of super profits, for they themselves are the source of super-profits. The Indian trade unions, if real, as the Meerut prisoners were making them, were bound to be of the same sort as the Chartist trade unions, and could never sink into the torpor and friendly society condition of the British craft unions in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

But the parallel with Chartism is insufficient. The Indian trade union movement is being born in the epoch of Imperialism, amid wars and revolutions, in the country that is a blazing furnace of colonial revolt against Imperialism.

Born in these circumstances, the Indian trade unions are bound to be but a first step. The Indian proletariat once aware of itself as a class, enters on a road when of necessity it is bound to organise trade unions, to organise its own independent working class party, to take the lead of the peasantry, to lead the whole national struggle for emancipation, and to find its goal (though not its final goal) in the overthrow of Imperialism, the independence of India, and the complete destruction of the feudal-imperialist régime.

British Imperialism recognises its deadliest enemy in the Indian working class and for this reason, tries to crush its advance by a reign of terror and sentences of transportation.

For this reason, too, because there is no reconciling of the interests of the Indian workers with the interests of the Imperialist bourgeoisie, all other interests and all parties are bound to take up their positions on one side or other. The British Labour Party, and the Trade Union Congress General Council, abandon their humanitarian pose when colonial

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

super-profits are at stake (for they share in these super-profits) and condemn the Meerut prisoners, only blaming the Government for not finishing them off more quickly. A sentiment with which the Tory Secretary of State for India cordially agreed, " this trial has gone on far too long," as he said when he took over this hangman's job from the Labour Government.

The pharisees of the General Council, celebrating this year the centenary of the Dorchester Labourers (sentenced to seven years' transportation a hundred years ago for organising trade unions in England), would not raise a finger to release the men who were organising trade unions in India.

On the other hand, the organisation of the Indian capitalists, the Indian National Congress, when faced by the sharpening class struggle, abandons its opposition to the " Satanic " British Raj, and its representative, Gandhi, signed a pact with the Viceroy which released 50,000 political captives, but kept the Meerut prisoners fast in their gaol.

The Meerut prisoners' trial and sentences raise the whole question of the right of workers to organise trade unions in a colonial country, where the masses are held down by naked force. For British Imperialism it is too dangerous, and for Gandhi and Lansbury also. But for British workers it is an elementary duty, which they cannot fail to carry through, to support the fight of working-class organisation in India, and to join with the Indian workers in their struggle against British Imperialism.

It is not only a duty: it is a necessity. Not only is it true that a nation that oppresses another cannot itself be free; but the same Imperialist class that is oppressing India, is oppressing and robbing the workers of this country by wage-cuts and speed-up, tariffs and taxes, is taking the bread out of the mouths of the workers' children, depriving them of the benefits of education, insurance and all other social services, and casting into gaol Tom Mann or any other leader of working class revolt. The railwaymen facing a wage-cut, the busmen on strike against speed-up, the Lancashire workers suffering under the Midland Agreement, are fighting the same class that would deny the Indian workers the right to organise.

But the deepest significance of the Meerut Trial and the reason for the extreme ferocity of the sentences, is that the representatives of the Indian masses and the representatives of the British working class were carrying on a united struggle against British Imperialism. For a hundred and fifty years British Capitalism has been a parasite on India, sucking its life-blood. For a hundred and fifty years every device of imperialist propaganda has been used to sunder the exploited of India from the exploited of Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is the glory of the Meerut prisoners that for the first time on such a charge representatives of the exploited classes of India and Britain stood together. Their stand is a symbol of that unity of the British working class with the masses of the British Empire which alone can destroy British Imperialism.

The Meerut prisoners, Englishmen and Indians in the dock together, destroyed once and for all the jingo picture of "black men" versus "white men," of "Asiatics against Europeans" and showed the true line of cleavage in a fight of the oppressed of both nations against the oppressors. To obtain their release, therefore, must be the object of both British and Indian workers. But it is the British Governments—Tory, Labour and National—that have kept them in prison. It is the British Government which is responsible for the sentence. The biggest responsibility lies with the British working class to secure their release, by nation-wide agitation in every organisation, in every kind of meeting.

The feeling of horror and indignation that was felt in the middle of January when the sentences were announced must grow into a powerful agitation that will force open the prison doors, annul these venomous sentences, and establish the workers' right to organisation in India.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WAR AND THE PARTITION OF CHINA

By R. BRIDGEMAN

(Secretary of the British Section of the League against Imperialism)

THE crisis in the Pacific area is most acutely reflected in the fighting between Japan and China, the extent and intensity of which are on a rapidly ascending scale. Other Powers are becoming more and more implicated in the conflict and it is the object of this article to describe in outline the present situation and the policy of the imperialist powers in so far as the partition of China is concerned.

On January 1 the armed forces of Japan commenced their attack upon Shanhaikwan which was soon reduced to a heap of ruins with a loss of some 3,000 lives. This was a prelude to the invasion of the province of Jehol, which had been projected long ago and the final preparations for which have been perfected since July, when Marshal Chang Hsueh-liang was warned that if he sent troops into Jehol the consequences would be serious. It is interesting to note that on a new map of Manchukuo which has recently been produced and distributed to the Editors of newspapers by the Japanese General Staff, Jehol is shown as part of Manchukuo. The next objective of the Japanese military authorities is believed to be Tientsin with the occupation of Peking as the ultimate aim.

Meanwhile, in order that Japan may have a free hand for the execution of her projects, the situation at Geneva where the Committee of 19 had been called together for the consideration of the Far-Eastern situation, was handled in such a way as to preclude the League of Nations from taking any action. France and Britain are openly supporting Japan, so much so that the correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* at Geneva reported as follows: "As for British policy, it is clearly more pro-Japanese than ever. A leader in the leading London paper on January 13, whose inspiration was evidently semi-official, has caused great emotion here. It confirms what has been learnt from other sources, namely, that the British Government, alarmed by the danger to which important British interests are exposed by the Japanese military measures, is trying to buy off Japan at the expense of China."

The manœuvres at Geneva in which the Secretary-General of the League of Nations appears to have involved himself have not unnaturally filled the Chinese Delegation with alarm, and its leader, Dr. W. W. Yen, protested against the alteration of the texts adopted by the Committee of Nineteen on December 20 without its knowledge and approval.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A large concentration of Chinese forces is taking place between Tientsin and Shanhaikwan, which has now been declared with British consent to be a neutral zone. China no longer exercises sovereign rights in Shanhaikwan.

These developments have stirred the national feelings of the Chinese to war-pitch, an army of 400,000 men is being mobilised and the Chinese Soviets have offered to the Kuomintang Government the full military support of the districts which they control in the campaign to expel the Japanese invaders on condition that hostilities against themselves are terminated.

Sino-Russian Relations

The danger of armed attack upon the Soviet Union has in no way diminished, and the armies of Japan appear to have advanced as far as the points where the Chinese Eastern Railway enters and leaves Manchuria, viz., Manchouli in the West and Pogranitchnaya in the East. Nevertheless, by its resolute adherence to a policy of peace and non-aggression, the Soviet Union has made its position as an anti-imperialist factor even clearer than it was before the deliberately provocative policy of Japan and her supporters had been carried to the present lengths, when a Japanese statesman justifies the increase in the Japanese war-budget by pointing to the defensive preparations of the U.S.S.R. as a menace.

The notes have now been published which were exchanged between the Japanese and Soviet Governments in regard to the conclusion of a pact of non-aggression first suggested by Litvinov to Yoshisawa on December 31, 1931, when the latter on relinquishing the Embassy in Paris was passing through Moscow on his way to Tokio to take up the portfolio of Foreign Affairs. The Japanese reply is to the effect that they consider that the time has not yet arrived for the conclusion of such a pact, but in declining the Russian proposal they suggest the creation of a Japan-Soviet-Manchurian Committee for the prevention of frontier incidents. This proposal the Soviet Government has expressed its willingness to consider.

The resumption of diplomatic relations between the U.S.S.R. and China which took place at the end of December was of the first importance, and appears to facilitate the conclusion of at least a trading agreement between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. as soon as Roosevelt succeeds Hoover in the Presidency of the United States in March.

Since the publication of the Lytton Report, which so plainly expresses the imperialist policy of the League of Nations, feeling in China has been growing more and more hostile to the League. Indeed, it seems to be possible that if either China or Japan retires from the League, China may

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be the first to do so, and it has been pointed out in the British Press that if China withdraws from Geneva " she will be forced into the arms of Russia," whose influence throughout China would become predominant.

The U.S.A. and China

Apart from the turmoil and distraction of opinion caused by the Presidential Election in the United States, the policy of America towards China has hitherto been indefinite and the feeling exists that she has experienced some difficulty in making up her mind what the policy is to be, while Roosevelt, The President-elect, is hopefully looked upon in the British press as a man of compromise.

The latest move of the Washington Government has been to instruct its Ambassadors in London and Paris to press the British and French Governments to adopt a firmer attitude with a view to reach some kind of decision at Geneva, conciliatory endeavour having lasted long enough and the hour for action having arrived. To give additional weight to America's intervention her Ambassador at Berlin proceeded to Geneva. Japan's economic and financial predicament is intensified by the exclusion policy pursued against orientals in the United States and Canada, as well as in Australia and New Zealand. This policy of racial discrimination which is being pursued by the white imperialists in the Pacific gives an excuse to Japanese imperialism to seek to enlarge their colonial Empire by the conquest of Manchuria and Mongolia, very much in the same way that Britain's fall from gold in September, 1931, impelled her to deprive India and Egypt of whatever financial advantages the gold standard presents, for her own personal advantage and in detriment of the interests of other countries on the gold standard.

There is too the heavy discrimination against Japanese textile imports into India in favour of British textiles, and it is obvious that unless the British Empire and the United States of America to begin with entirely reverse their present fiscal and social policy in so far as Japan is concerned, and until the Japanese are admitted freely and on a footing of equality into British and American Dominions, they will not pay any attention to admonitions of peace. No proposals for peace which may be made to Japan will have the slightest prospect of success unless they be accompanied by a promise that the existing barriers of discrimination against Japanese immigrants and Japanese goods are to be abolished.

America controls the largest share of China's foreign trade, a share larger even than that of Japan, whose share is now larger than Britain's. Any alteration of the *status quo* in China is viewed therefore with extreme suspicion by America, who has, from the first, indicated that she would not recognise the detachment of Manchuria from China. The Japanese have been at pains to prove that the State of Manchukuo came into

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

existence by the free choice of the inhabitants of the country, that she has merely recognised the existence of the new State, to which she has accredited an Ambassador and not a Governor or a High Commissioner, because she seeks to argue that Manchukuo is in no way subject to Japanese control. Documents proving the independence of Manchukuo and so justifying the Japanese contention that there has been no breach of the Nine-Power Treaty of Washington by Japan have been widely distributed.

It would probably be correct to say that in so far as the Nanking Government—the Kuomintang Government—is concerned, American influence is stronger than that of any other Power. If it be the case that China is menaced with partition by the imperialist powers then, obviously, a country, albeit imperialist with armed forces stationed on Chinese territory, which is opposed to partition, exercises greater influence than countries like Britain or France which would expect to benefit from such a partition. But America, while condemning the aggression of Japan, has been half-hearted in granting support to China, always hoping, apparently, that she would have the opportunity of acting jointly with Britain and France, and shrinking from the isolation which independent action against Japan would have brought.

Actually owing to the controversy over the debts, Lausanne, disarmament, the Ottawa tariff arrangements, and perhaps more important than all the Gold Standard, relations between England and America have become cool, and this has not facilitated co-operation in the Far East. Just as France found Japanese support at Geneva very valuable for the prosecution of her policy in Europe, so Britain feels that the sympathy of Japan is essential to her both as regards her policy towards the Soviet Union and towards the United States of America. Britain to-day feels a greater need of the Japanese alliance than she had even at the beginning of the 20th century.

With regard to the recognition of the new Manchurian State, the Japanese government has argued that it is necessary both for the safety of Japan and as a barrier against Communism, and that a restoration of Chinese suzerainty would mean a return to former evils. Count Uchida, the President of the South Manchurian Railway, who became Foreign Minister in June, 1932, explaining the attitude of Japan to the Lytton Commission, said that the independence of Manchuria must be accepted as an accomplished fact and that in no circumstances would Japan agree to that region being placed again under Chinese rule. He maintained that the recognition of the Manchukuo Government did not conflict with the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922, and advocated that recognition should be given as soon as possible in answer to the demands of the Japanese residents and of the Manchurian Government. Had Japan proposed to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

annex Manchuria the position would have been different, but this she had no intention of doing. Recognition of Manchukuo by Japan took place on September 15, 1932. It was received with intense indignation in China, where the day was observed as a " Day of National Humiliation."

In order to strengthen the position of the Japanese communities among the rapidly-increasing Chinese population of Manchuria, a scheme is in preparation for mass colonisation from Japan on a very extended scale; the possibility of re-establishing a naval base at Port Arthur is also being considered.

Manchurian Resistance to Japanese Aggression

Ever since the Japanese invasion of Manchuria commenced in September, 1931, the Chinese volunteer corps have maintained and developed their stand against the invaders. Recently fifteen commanders of these anti-Manchukuo forces addressed a telegram to the United States of America appealing for assistance against the Japanese. The main idea of the population of Manchuria is to get rid of the Japanese and their tools.

It is estimated that about 30,000 anti-Manchukuo troops are located in the area along the railway line from Changchun to Kirin. Especially heavy fighting has been proceeding round Tsitsihar and on the lower course of the Sungari River. The number of Japanese troops in Manchuria has been steadily increased and now amounts to 150,000. The Chinese volunteer leaders in Manchuria who have been most conspicuous in the fight against Japan are the Generals Ma Chan-san, Su Ping-wen, Ting Chao and Li Tu. In spite, however, of their vigorous resistance the Chinese are being gradually driven back by the more fully equipped forces of the invaders. Su Ping-wen and Li Tu have had to cross the Soviet frontier and have been interned. The Soviet Government was pressed by the Japanese to hand over Su Ping-wen to them, but the Foreign Commissar of the Soviets refused to comply with this request.

The reports concerning the attitude of General Ma have been confusing. When the Japanese invasion of Manchuria started he was entrusted with the defence of Heilungkiang and became Chairman of the Heilungkiang Provincial Government. When, after failing to persuade General Ma to surrender, the Japanese launched their attack on Heilungkiang in November, 1931, he fought with the utmost determination on the frozen banks of the Nonni river, thereby raising himself to world renown. Shortage of munitions and lack of reinforcements compelled him to retire and when the Japanese captured Tsitsihar on November 18 he transferred the Heilungkiang Provincial Government to Hailun.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After further stubborn resistance to the repeated attacks of the Japanese, General Ma appears to have realised that defeat was inevitable. He therefore accepted the Japanese invitation to join the Manchukuo administration in which he was given the Cabinet post of Minister of War. He continued, however, to retain his hold on Heilungkiang as Chairman of the Provincial Government. After obtaining military supplies and funds from the Japanese General Ma proceeded to Tsitsihar under pretext of an inspection tour. There he carried out a Coup d'Etat, and moving to Hailun, declared his opposition to Manchukuo and the Japanese invaders just at the time that the Lytton Enquiry Commission arrived in Manchuria. Since then he has been conducting an active campaign against the Japanese at the head of the Heilungkiang Army north of Hailun.

In the Lower Sungari region the Japanese have effectively held certain fixed points, but have not been able to carry on operations at any distance from these or to cope with the large forces of the " partisan " troops estimated at many thousands who have retired into the mountainous and wooded country further east.

In the Chientao district on the Korean border conditions were so threatening that British residents were advised to leave.

In July the Chinese already saw reason to believe that the Japanese were seeking a pretext for the invasion of Jehol. In August heavy fighting took place between the Manchurian State forces, supported by the Japanese, and Chinese partisan troops in the neighbourhood of Newchwang and Haicheng. This, in conjunction with a series of raids by small bands of volunteers—usually referred to as brigands by the capitalist press—caused considerable alarm in the Japanese settlements along the South Manchurian Railway. Mukden arsenal and the Japanese air-base and wireless station were attacked by a strong force of Chinese and the two latter were set on fire.

In an attempt to justify the wide-scale operations in Manchuria Count Uchida, Foreign Minister of Japan, in the Diet at Tokio, claimed that Japan had only acted in self-defence and that self-defence might reasonably extend beyond the limits of the country exercising that right.

The Japanese are faced with considerable difficulties in Manchuria, and even if the Chinese armies are broken up or driven over the frontier, guerilla warfare will continue for an indefinite period similar to that which the British have encountered almost without interruption since they embarked on the conquest of Burma. Manchuria is for the most part densely wooded, and as the Manchukuo forces are unreliable and as the Japanese themselves are unaccustomed to any but open fighting, the process of subduing the resistance of the workers and peasants of Manchuria is likely to be protracted.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Partition Plans

In the summer of 1930 it was stated that Colonel Weir, the British Resident in Sikkim, was proceeding on a special mission for the Government of India to Lhassa, the capital of Tibet. With the recollection of the agreement of 1907 between Britain and Tsarist Russia in regard to Tibet in our mind, it is impossible not to connect the recent developments in that country with the visit of a representative of the Government of India to Lhassa, and it may be of interest to recall here the outlines of that famous inter-imperialist pact defining the policy of Britain and Russia towards the buffer-states of Persia and Afghanistan as well as towards Tibet. Under the portion of that agreement relating to Tibet, both parties, after recognising the suzerain rights of China, undertook (1) to respect the territorial integrity of Tibet and to abstain from interfering in the internal administration; (2) to treat with Tibet only through the intermediary of the Chinese Government; (3) not to send representatives to Lhassa; (4) not to seek concessions of any kind in Tibet; and (5) not to acquire any lien on Tibetan revenues.

Now, for nearly a year, heavy fighting has been in progress between Chinese and Tibetans in the territory of indeterminate frontiers between the new Chinese Province of Sikang (comprising part of Western Szechuen and Inner Tibet) and Tibet proper. The fighting started in the Spring when Liu Hsiang, who is regarded as a British agent, at the head of 70,000 men, revolted against the Chairman of the Szechuen Provincial Government and representative of the Kuomintang Government, Liu Wen-hui, who is now the Commander-in-Chief of the Szecheun frontier Defence Force. When this trouble began the Dalai Lama, the Buddhist Priest-King of Tibet mobilised his forces, and on the pretext of "defending the frontiers of Tibet," invaded Sikang with the object of adding it to his own dominions.

The Dalai Lama is believed to have been provided with guns, military equipment and funds by the Government of India, much in the same way as the King of Afghanistan, after being assisted to establish himself on the Afghan throne, was granted an interest free loan, of £170,000 and 10,000 rifles and ammunition by Britain in 1931. The Government of India is also reported to have helped with the reorganisation of the Tibetan army, while English is being taught to a rapidly-increasing extent in the schools of Tibet in preference to Chinese.

According to recent news the Tibetans are still besieging Batang, the Chief town of Sikang, and the total number of troops in Szecheun approaches 300,000, their upkeep costing the people of the province more than £20,000,000 annually. North of Batang the Chinese have succeeded in driving the Tibetans across the Upper Yangtse. At the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beginning of December the Chinese steamship, *Wanan*, transporting troops for Liu Hsiang, the British nominee, was attacked by the Chinese Government forces with machine-guns near Chungking. The vessel was riddled from end to end, and when she reached Hankow 200 dead bodies were found on board.

In the middle of October the Panshen Lama of Tibet arrived in Peking. Owing to a quarrel with the Dalai Lama he quitted Tibet some years ago and has since resided in China. Although the junior of the two Buddhist Pontiffs of Tibet, the Panshen (or Tashi) Lama is joint-heir with the Dalai Lama of the Buddhist inheritance, and is believed by the Tibetans to be worthy of even higher veneration than the Dalai Lama, because his office and functions are purely religious, while those of the Dalai Lama are concerned with temporal as well as religious affairs. General Wu Pei-fu, Marshal Tuan Chi-jui and other members of the Anfu Party, who from of old received the support of Japan, notably in the matter of the Nishehara Loans of 1917-18, also prominent opponents of the Nanking Government such as Yen Hsi-shan and Sun Chuan-fang, came to Peking at the same time as the Buddhist dignitary.

Some observers believe that the assembly of these persons indicates the progress of a separatist movement for the establishment of an "Independent Republic of North China," others perceive indications of an intention on the part of the Chinese Government to reinstate the Panshen Lama in control of Lhassa in place of the Anglo-phil Dalai Lama. Mention has also been made of a movement towards the unity of religious leadership in China in the person of the Panshen Lama exercising control not over China only but over Tibet and Mongolia as well.

Such a scheme would upset the plans attributed to British Imperialism, to which the Japanese Press has been referring lately, to place the Dalai Lama at the head of a "Great Tibet" Empire. "Great Tibet" under British direction and control would extend from the province of Szechuen to Mongolia and besides Tibet would include Chinese Turkestan (Sinkiang), bringing the British sphere of influence up to the frontier of the Soviet Union.

There would be nothing in these projects to conflict with the recommendation of the Lytton Report for "temporary international co-operation in the internal reconstruction of China."

If these plans were realised a big buffer-state would have been set up as a wedge between the British Indian Empire with Burma, the Soviet Districts of China, and the U.S.S.R., while Japan would be consolidating her hold upon Manchuria, and France would acquire control over the Southern provinces of China, Yunnan, Kwangsi and Kwangtung.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In reference to the policy of French imperialism and its consistent support of Japanese imperialism it is important to recall the terms of the agreement concluded in Paris between France and Japan in 1907 and stated by M. Herriot as lately as last November, to be still in force, under which the two countries engaged to support each other for assuring peace and security in the regions of the Chinese Empire adjacent to the territories where they have rights of sovereignty, protection or occupation with a view to maintaining the respective situation and the territorial rights of the two countries in the continent of Asia.

Reports of a movement in Tibet hostile to the Dalai Lama and leading to civil war have been published in the British Press. The Tibetans have no doubt been influenced by the growing exploitation of which they have been so long the victims at the hands of parasitical Lamas, whose corruption has provoked revolt, and if the Dalai Lama is suspected of allowing the country to pass under British control, the movement against him would be easy to account for.

The Japanese Government has made it clear in recent Ministerial utterances that the relations of Japan with China are of even greater importance than the question of Manchuria and Mongolia, and there is no doubt that the progressive Sovietisation of China is causing deep concern to Japanese statesmen, and confirming their willingness to enter into arrangements for the division of the country. One of the arguments employed by Japan in justification for the recognition of the new Manchurian state is that it is necessary both for the safety of Japan and as a barrier against Communism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS WORKS

By AN EYE-WITNESS

AT this centre of what is wrongly called the " League of Nations," it is not nations but their capitalist Governments which are represented—with the exception of the U.S.S.R., where there are no capitalists, and the working class is in power. All the governments of the world meet here, through their official delegates, and exchange propaganda through their press bureaux and journalists.

This concentration of capitalist interests from all countries is palmed off upon the workers as " internationalism." The League of Nations Union, the Labour Party, numerous Liberal and religious organisations, all join in spreading this illusion. In order to heighten it, no less than 60 or 70 reforming societies and pacifist organisations of all kinds have fixed their headquarters at Geneva. Passionate debates go on in thousands of meetings all over the world, oceans of ink are spilled both in sorrow and in anger, on the question of whether Geneva has " failed " or not, whether the League is " ineffective " or otherwise, whether its machinery does make " some progress for internationalism " or not.

But always the capitalists and the League of Nations' propagandists hide from the people one problem : how an international assembly of bandits can be anything else but a bandits' international. Yet this is the problem on which everything else turns. Political leaders who share collective and individual responsibility in their home countries for large-scale banditry and oppression in India, Indo-China, Nicaragua, Manchuria, etc., don't change their personality when they set foot on Geneva soil.

The internationalism permitted at Geneva is and can be only the internationalism which suits the robbers and murderers of the masses. As such it cannot be a " step forward," whether " hesitating " or otherwise : it can only be—to the extent that the peoples fail to see its real character—a mask or cloak, *i.e.*, a step back. The fact that the " International Entente against the Third International "—a propaganda body directly connected with Russian White military and terrorist groups—has its permanent seat at Geneva, while the Geneva and Swiss authorities refused permission for the two-days' World Anti-War Congress to be held there, throws a vivid light on the kind of internationalism which prevails in this city.

The concentration of the capitalist interests represented at Geneva has its inconveniences for the capitalists as well as its advantages. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inconveniences arise when the inevitable clashes of interests break through the harmony of fake "internationalism," and are echoed throughout the world all the more loudly because the sounding-board has the public ear so completely. And the clashes *are* inevitable. Capitalism—the system of production for the market, for private profit—cannot be organised, planned or harmonised on a national scale, much less international. "Organised capitalism" is a contradiction in terms. And the more disorganised the capitalist world—the more the world economic crisis deepens, markets contract, the struggle for them grows fiercer, tariff barriers higher—the more the inconveniences make themselves felt. This has dire results for the prestige of the League of Nations and its associated institutions.

One great show-up, on a truly world scale, already occurred in the summer of 1932. At the Disarmament Conference, heralded by five years' preparatory work, one capitalist country after another—U.S.A., Britain, France and, quite recently, Japan—brought forward its proposal for disarmament. A very rapid examination of each proposal, however, revealed that it was constructed in such a way as to affect the forces of the proposer least and those of its rivals most. Directly any attempt was made to propose disarmament in such a way as to affect all the heavily-armed imperialist powers first and foremost, it was completely defeated. This was the fate of the successive Soviet proposals for general total disarmament, partial 50 per cent. disarmament, and, finally, "substantial reduction of armaments," during the preparatory commission. It was equally the fate of the Soviet motion in July to adopt the U.S.A. (Hoover) plan for $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. cut in all arms. The American delegation itself joined its imperialist rivals in voting down—its own proposal. Thus all the efforts of the imperialist powers to make use of the Disarmament Conference as a parade of their love for peace broke down in utter and abject failure on the rock of their irreconcilable antagonism—not only among themselves, but between all of them and the U.S.S.R.

During the last few weeks, the inexorable realities of imperialist enmity on half-a-dozen major issues have once again burst through the thin tissue of make-believe internationalism at Geneva. Since Great Britain declared economic war on the U.S.A. at Ottawa, and followed this up by transferring its strongest naval forces to the Atlantic, as well as proceeding with its delayed 1931 programme of warship construction, the U.S.A. had been pressing to wind up the Disarmament Conference and thus set all hands free for the coming armaments race—in which the richest wins. The American representative at Geneva definitely proposed to his colleagues of the big Powers a scheme for winding up the Conference until 1936, with a face-saving interim Convention that would disarm nobody by one rifle, bomb, or cockleshell. Contradiction number one (England v. U.S.A. in the struggle to dominate the world),

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But the same economic crisis which led to Ottawa also made the resumption of debt payments by Britain to the U.S.A. a serious financial problem for British capitalism. So long as there was the slightest chance of the American creditor behaving totally unlike all other creditors, and voluntarily reducing his claims, British representatives at Geneva toyed not ungracefully with the American disarmament scheme, and even spread rumours that it had their warm support—to the delight of the Germans, who wanted a free hand to re-arm, and to the displeasure of the French, who above all, don't want the Germans to re-arm. But as soon as Hoover and Roosevelt said, loudly and unmistakeably : " Pay," the British delegates saw the game was up, turned a complete somersault, and equally loudly backed France in declaring " The Conference goes on ! " Contradiction number two (Debtor Europe v. Creditor U.S.A.).

For months, even years, British imperialism has been trying to patch up an understanding between France and Germany. This was not in order to secure the pacification of Europe : Mr. Ormsby-Gore revealed that in his famous " indiscretion " of 1925. The object was to secure Britain's rear in the event of war with the U.S.A., to create at all events a counterweight to France, and to include Germany in the still broken front against the U.S.S.R. Always the attempts have broken down over the French fear of a German revenge for the Versailles Treaty. The latest attempt was to arrange among the five imperialist powers a satisfactory settlement of the German demand for " equality of right," *i.e.*, the right of the German capitalist class to arm against its own proletariat, against Poland and against the Soviet Union. The difficulty was to meet at the same time the French counter-demand for " security," *i.e.*, security that this armament would not be sufficient to fight France and her other allies. The price which Britain paid for the bloc with France against U.S.A. on debts was acceptance in all essentials of the French formula on " equality." The *Temps*, the mouthpiece of French imperialism, calls the Five-Power resolution : " Not an ideal solution, but an honest compromise " (December 11, 1932)—a sufficiently eloquent testimony. The Germans have had once again to put their aspirations in their pockets, and content themselves with an empty promise—until next time. Contradiction number three (Victors v. Vanquished in the last world war).

Prompted by the grave internal situation in Japan, on the one hand, and the successes of the Chinese Red Army in the interior of China, on the other, Japan has during the last 15 months been consolidating its grip on Manchuria. The American hostility to Japan, coinciding with the demands of the mass of the Chinese people, has been sufficient to ensure the continued resistance of the Kuomintang Government to the separation of Manchuria, the despatch of the Lytton Commission, and the gesture of the four smaller countries, headed by the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Irish Free State, for the condemnation of Japan and the non-recognition of "Manchukuo." But the fact that the U.S.A. is unable as yet to fight, on the one hand, and the coming together of its chief debtors in a united anti-U.S.A. front on the other, determined the result. The new resolution of the "Committee of Nineteen" nominally provides for several more months of conciliation, but actually for the further reinforcement and ultimate recognition of Japanese rule in Manchuria. Contradiction number four (U.S.A. v. Japan, and to a lesser extent Britain, in the struggle for control of China).

The failure of the Chinese appeal to the League, and the open mockery of their obligations under the League Covenant by the chief imperialist powers, are already causing widespread disillusionment in China. The resumption of diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R. is the first gesture of the counter-revolutionary Kuomintang Government in response to this mass disappointment. But taking into account the profound and deepening economic crisis in China itself, and the renewed attacks of Japan, there is no reason to suppose that the masses will be satisfied with this. Further successes for the cause of Communism, a vast extension of the Soviet areas in China, must be expected in the next few months. The mockery of the League's dealings with China becomes all the more apparent when they are contrasted with the lightning speed at which a suitable article of the Covenant has been found, and an emergency Assembly summoned, to deal with another conflict between a great imperialist power and a people struggling to emerge from a semi-colonial status—the Perso-British dispute over the oil concession, secured on highly favourable terms at a time when Persia was ruled by a corrupt autocracy. In reality it is even more obvious than in the case of Manchuria that only one side is guilty of armed aggression, and is thereby infringing the Kellogg Pact—the imperialist great power involved. It is not by chance that the elaborate 30-page British memorandum to the League Council, which is full of professions of desire for an amicable settlement, "forgets" to mention the movement of British warships. But the League will undoubtedly support Great Britain against Persia, notwithstanding the influence which the U.S.A. (Standard Oil) is endeavouring to exert for Persia behind the scenes. The alternative would be the surrender of all the imperialist concessions secured in years past in the colonies—the Soviet policy. Contradiction number five (the imperialist robber Powers v. the struggling colonial peoples).

Touching upon all of these, even when occasionally in the background are other contradictions, above all, the fundamental one which exists between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world. It shows itself very clearly (as all the world saw last July), when the Disarmament Conference meets, because the Soviet Government is the only power

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which, having no capitalist investments to promote or protect, has no interest in oppressing other peoples or maintaining armed forces for the purpose. Between the sessions of the Disarmament Conference, the contradiction shows itself in the rupture of the Trade Agreement by Great Britain, the hostility of a number of Governments (Belgian, Czecho-Slovak, Yugoslav, Spanish, U.S.A.) to normal diplomatic relations with the U.S.S.R., and the ferocious campaign of utterly unrestrained lying about the Soviet Union which has recently been renewed by the Christian and Jewish priests of all countries, under the practised leadership of the Pope of Rome.

These are the realities of " Geneva," or capitalist, internationalism. For workers in particular, or friends of peace in general, to pin their faith to Geneva, the League of Nations, or to any other activities of capitalist governments, means simply burying their heads in the sand to avoid noticing unpleasant facts. There is only one way to secure the triumph of internationalism—by securing the triumph of the proletariat, the only class interested in internationalism as a vital condition of its existence. The way to this lies through the overthrow of the capitalist governments, thereby putting an end to their national interests and national contradictions. The constant and widest possible exposure of the League of Nations is essential if friends of peace, fighters in the anti-war movement, friends of the Soviet Union, want to assist the peoples of all countries in arriving at the revolutionary conclusion once aptly formulated by Karl Liebknecht: " The enemy is in one's own country."

* * * * *

P.S.—Here are words which are none the worse from having been conveniently forgotten. " This new Union of Nations, it must be assumed, will be managed just as existing alliances are managed, for it does not propose to make any of the changes in international relations which I think essential. It is a League of the old order of national policy, not of the new. Within the Union there will be alliances and understandings, co-operations and rivalries. Outside it there will be the disputes of diplomacies and capitalism, the problems of markets, the campaigns of politicians, the unremoved fears and suspicions of nations. The Union itself will be controlled by the governing authorities of the nations, from whose point of view its activities will be conducted. It might even become a menace to liberty like a new Holy Alliance. It will certainly have all the small nations at its mercy, and whilst presumably it would suppress rebellion, it would have no power to deal with the demand of subject peoples striving for liberty. *The handing over of the issues of peace and war to an international committee of the governing classes gives no security to the people that the forces of the world will be used only in causes of righteousness and liberty. . . .*" (J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P., in *National Defence : A Study in Militarism.* George Allen and Unwin, 1917.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IMPERIALISM AND THE SPLIT IN SOCIALISM

By N. LENIN

[*The article printed below in a slightly abridged form and specially translated for* THE LABOUR MONTHLY *from the Russian was written by Lenin in the Autumn of 1916. It was published in December, 1916, in the "Collection from the Social Democrat" (No. 2.)*].

IS there any connection between imperialism and that absolutely unparalleled victory which opportunism (in the form of social-chauvinism) has gained over the working class movement in Europe?

This is the fundamental question of contemporary socialism. It will only be possible and necessary to proceed to an analysis of this fundamental question after we have once and for all established in our Party literature; firstly, the imperialist character of our epoch and the present war; secondly, the indissoluble historical connection of social chauvinism with opportunism, and, in like manner, the similarity of the content of their political ideas.

It is necessary to commence with as accurate and as complete a definition of imperialism as possible. Imperialism is a particular historic stage of capitalism. Its particular features are threefold: Imperialism is (1) monopoly capitalism; (2) parasitic or decaying capitalism; (3) dying capitalism. The change from free competition to monopoly is the basic economic feature, the *essence* of imperialism. Monopoly manifests itself in five main aspects: (1) cartels, syndicates and trusts; concentration of production has reached such a stage that it has given birth to these monopolist associations of capitalists; (2) monopolist position of the big banks: three to five gigantic banks dominate the whole economic life of America, France, Germany; (3) seizure of the sources of *raw materials* by the trusts and financial oligarchy (finance capital is monopolist industrial capital, which has fused with banking capital); (4) the division (economic) of the world by the international cartels *has commenced.* Such international cartels, ruling the *whole* world market and dividing it "amicably" until war re-distributes it—already amount to over a *hundred.* The export of capital, as an especially characteristic feature, as distinct from the export of commodities in the epoch of non-monopoly capitalism, stands in close relation to the economic and political-territorial division of the world. (5) The territorial division of the world (colonies) *is completed.*

Imperialism, as the highest stage of capitalism in America and Europe, and subsequently in Asia, became fully developed in the period

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1898-1914. The Spanish-American war of 1898, the Anglo-Boer war (1900-1902), the Russo-Japanese war (1904-1905), and the economic crisis in Europe in 1900—these are the chief historical landmarks of this new epoch in the history of the world.

That imperialism is parasitic or decaying capitalism is shown, in the first place, in the tendency to decay, which distinguishes *every* monopoly under the private ownership of the means of production. The difference between the republican democratic and the reactionary monarchist bourgeoisie disappears precisely because both are rotting alive (which in no way does away with the amazingly rapid development of capitalism in various spheres of industry, in different countries, at various periods). Secondly, the decay of capitalism manifests itself in the creation of a huge section of *rentiers*, capitalists, who live by clipping coupons. In each of the four foremost imperialist countries, England, America, France and Germany, capital in securities comprises 100-150 milliard francs, which means a yearly revenue of not less than 5-8 milliards per country.[1] Thirdly, the export of capital has the effect of multiplying parasitism by itself. Fourthly, " finance-capital strives towards domination, and not towards freedom." Political reaction along the *whole* line—is the essence of imperialism. Bribery, corruption to a gigantic degree. Panama scandals of every kind. Fifthly, the exploitation of oppressed nations, indissolubly bound up with annexations, and the especial exploitation of the colonies by a handful of " great " powers, increasingly transforms the " civilised " world into a parasite on the body of millions of uncivilised peoples. The Roman proletarian lived at the expense of society. Present day society lives at the expense of the modern proletarian. Marx particularly emphasised this profound remark of Sismondi. Imperialism to some degree changes this. To a certain extent, a privileged section of the proletariat of the imperialist powers lives at the expense of hundreds of millions of uncivilised peoples.

It is evident why imperialism is *dying* capitalism, transitional to socialism: monopoly, growing out of capitalism, is *already* the dying of capitalism, the beginning of its going over to socialism. The gigantic *socialisation* of labour by imperialism (which its apologists, the bourgeois economists, call " interlacing ") means the same thing.

In putting forward this definition of imperialism we differ completely from Karl Kautsky, who, it appears, sees in imperialism a " phase of capitalism " and defines imperialism as a *policy* " preferred " by finance capital; as a striving of " industrial " countries to annex " agrarian

[1] At pre-war par rate of exchange these two figures would have been equivalent to 4-6 milliard pounds, and 250-320 million pounds respectively. [Ed.]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries."[2] Kautsky's definition is absolutely false theoretically. The particular feature of imperialism—is precisely the domination, *not* of industrial but of finance capital, the tendency towards annexations, *not* only of agrarian, but of *all* countries. Kautsky isolates the *policy* of imperialism from its economics; isolates monopoly in politics from monopoly in economics, in order to clear the way for his trivial bourgeois reformism, such as "disarmament," "ultra-imperialism" and similar nonsense. The aim of this theoretical falsehood is wholly designed to hide the *deepest* contradictions in imperialism, and so justify the theory of "unity" with the apologists of imperialism, with frank social-chauvinists and opportunists.

The proletariat is an offspring of capitalism—world capitalism, not merely European, and not only imperialist. On a world scale—50 years earlier or 50 years later, from the point of view of *this* scale the question is a special one—the "proletariat" of course, "will be" united, and "inevitably" revolutionary social democracy will be victorious amongst the proletariat. That is not the point, Messrs. Kautskians. The point is that now, in the imperialist countries of Europe, *you* are the *lackeys* of the opportunists, who are *alien* to the proletariat, as a class, who are the servants, agents, and transmitters of the influence of the bourgeoisie, and unless it is *rid of you* the labour movement remains a *bourgeois labour movement*. Your propaganda for "unity" with the opportunists, with Legien and David, Plekhanov or Chkhenkeli and Potresov, &c., is, objectively a defence of the *enslavement* of the workers by the imperialist bourgeoisie aided by its best agents in the working class movement. The victory of revolutionary social democracy on a world scale is absolutely inevitable, but it is coming and will come, it is being consummated and will be consummated *against* you, and will be victorious *over* you.

Those two tendencies, yes even *two* parties in the modern working class movement, which so manifestly parted company throughout the whole world in 1914-1916, were carefully *traced by Engels and Marx in England* through several *decades*, approximately from 1858-1892.

Neither Marx, nor Engels lived to see the imperialist epoch of world capitalism, which first began in the years 1898-1900. But the peculiarity of England was that already from the middle of the 19th century, at least *two* outstanding features of imperialism were present: (1) immense colonies and (2) monopoly profit (due to its monopoly position on the world market). In both connections England was then an exception

[2] Imperialism is the product of highly developed industrial capitalism. It consists in the tendency of every industrial capitalist nation more and more to subordinate or to bring under their control all the big *agrarian* regions irrespective of what nations inhabit those regions. (Kautsky's article "Imperialism," published in the *New Times* (*Neue Zeit*, No. 21, 11 September, 1914).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amongst the capitalist countries, and Engels together with Marx in analysing this exception, absolutely clearly and definitely pointed out its *relation* to the temporary victory of opportunism in the English working class movement.

In a letter to Marx dated the 7th October, 1858, Engels wrote :

> The English proletariat actually becomes more and more bourgeoisified, so that this most bourgeois of all nations apparently desires to bring matters to such a pass as to have a bourgeois aristocracy and bourgeois proletariat *side by side* with the bourgeoisie. Obviously, this is to a certain extent, well calculated, on the part of a nation which is exploiting the world.

In a letter to Sorge dated the 21st September, 1872, Engels informs him that Hales made a terrific row in the Federal Council of the International and " secured a vote of censure on Marx, for his words that the English Labour leaders had sold themselves."

Marx writes to Sorge on the 4th April, 1874 :

> As regards the urban workers here (in England) one is forced to regret that the whole band of leaders don't get into Parliament. This would be the surest way of getting rid of this mob.

Engels, in a letter to Marx, dated the 11th August, 1881, talks of " the worst of the English trade unions, which allow themselves to be ruled by people, bought over by the bourgeoisie, or at any rate, paid by it." In a letter to Kautsky dated the 12th September, 1882, Engels wrote :

> You ask me, what the English workers think about colonial policy ? Precisely the same as they think of politics generally. Here there is no working class party, there are only Conservative and Liberal radicals, and the workers freely enjoy with them the fruits of the colonial monopoly of England and its monopoly of the world market.

In a letter of the 19th April, 1890, he says :

> The movement (of the working class in England) proceeding under the surface, embraces ever wider sections, the great majority of whom have been the hitherto motionless *lowest* (emphasis Engels) masses, and the day is not far off, when this mass *will discover itself*, when it will see clearly that it alone is that colossal moving mass.

On the 4th March, 1891, he writes : " With the failure of the disrupted Dockers' Union, the ' old ' conservative trade unions, *rich* and, therefore, cowardly, remain alone on the field of battle." . . . On September 14th, 1891, at the Newcastle Trades Union Congress the old unionists, opponents of the 8-hour day were defeated " and the bourgeois newspapers admit the defeat of the *bourgeois labour party*." (All italics are Engels).

These ideas of Engels, repeated in the course of a decade, were also expressed by him publicly, in the press, as is proved by his preface to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the second edition (1892) of *The Condition of the Working Class in England.* Here mention is made of " the aristocracy among the working class " of " the privileged minority of the workers," in contrast to the " wide masses of the workers." " A small, privileged, ' protected ' minority " of the working class, were the only ones who " permanently benefited " from the privileged position of England in 1848-68 ; " the great bulk of them experienced but a temporary improvement of their conditions," . . . " With the breakdown of England's industrial monopoly, the English working class will lose that privileged position." The membership of the " New Unionism," unions of unskilled workers, " had this immense advantage, that *their minds were virgin soil*, entirely free from inherited ' respectable ' bourgeois prejudices, which hampered the brains of the better situated ' old ' unionists." . . . " So-called workers' representatives " is the title given to people in England, " who are forgiven their position as workers, because they would rather drown themselves in the ocean of their liberalism."

We have taken these fairly detailed extracts from Marx and Engels, in order that readers might become fully acquainted with them. Not only is it essential to become acquainted with them but it is worth while paying deep attention to them. Because here is the *key* to those tactics in the working class movement, which are dictated by the objective conditions of the imperialist epoch.

Already here, Kautsky has endeavoured to " trouble the waters " and to substitute for Marxism, sugar-coated conciliation with the opportunists. Polemising with the frank and naïve social-imperialists (like Lensch) who justify the war from the standpoint of Germany, as the destruction of England's monopoly, Kautsky " *corrects* " this obvious falsehood by another one, just as obviously false. In the place of a cynical falsehood, he uses a sugar-coated one ! The *industrial* monopoly of England has long been broken, he says ; it has long been destroyed. There is nothing more that can or need to be destroyed.

Wherein lies the falsity in this argument ?

Firstly, the *colonial* monopoly of England is ignored. And Engels, as we have seen, already in 1882, 34 years ago, quite clearly directed attention to it. Even if England's industrial monopoly has been destroyed, its colonial monopoly not only remains, but is extraordinarily increased, for the whole world has already been divided. By means of his sugar-coated lies, Kautsky smuggles through a bourgeois pacifist and opportunist philistine idea, to the effect that " well, there's nothing to wage war about." On the contrary, not only is there something for the *capitalists* to fight for now, but it is *impossible not to* fight, if they desire to retain

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalism, for without a forcible redistribution of the colonies, the *new* imperialist countries cannot obtain those privileges which the older (*and less strong*) imperialist countries enjoy.

Secondly, Why does England's monopoly explain the (temporary) victory of opportunism in England? Because, monopoly yields *super-profit*, *i.e.*, a surplus of profit above that capitalist profit which is normal and usual throughout the world. From this super-profit the capitalists *are able* to set aside a portion (and by no means a small one) in order to bribe *their* workers, to create something similar to a union (recollect the famous "alliances" of the English trade unions with their masters, described by the Webbs) the union of the workers of this particular nation with their masters *against* the other countries. The industrial monopoly of England was destroyed even at the end of the 19th century. This is indisputable. But *how* did this destruction take place? Is it true, that *all* monopoly disappeared?

If this were so, then Kautsky's "theory" of conciliation (with opportunism) would have a certain amount of justification. But the fact is, that it is *not* so. Imperialism *is* monopoly capitalism. Every cartel, trust, syndicate, every gigantic big bank *is* a monopoly. Super-profit has not disappeared. It has remained. The exploitation of every country by a single privileged, financially rich one, persists, and has strengthened. A handful of rich countries—in all there are four, if one speaks of independent and really gigantic "modern" wealth; England, France, U.S.A., and Germany; this handful has developed monopoly to an immeasurable degree, and receives super-profit to the extent of hundreds of millions, even milliards; it "rides on the back" of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people in other countries, and it fights among itself for the division of that booty which is the most luxurious, most plentiful, and the easiest to get.

This is the economic and political essence of imperialism, the profound contradictions of which Kautsky covers up, instead of exposing.

The bourgeoisie of a "great" imperialist power is economically in a position to bribe the higher sections of "its" workers, expending on this a hundred or so million francs a year, since its super-profit comprises undoubtedly, nearly a milliard. It is of secondary importance as to how this small bribe is divided amongst the labour ministers, "the workers' representatives" (remember Engels' splendid analysis of this conception), the labour participants in the war-industry committees, labour officials, workers, organised in narrow craft unions, employees and so on.

During the period 1848-68 and for a short time afterwards, England alone enjoyed a monopoly; therefore, opportunism was victorious for decades; there were no other countries with rich colonies or with industrial monopolies.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The last third of the 19th century was a transition to the new imperialist epoch. Monopoly is enjoyed by the finance capital, not of one, but of a limited few great powers. (In Japan and Russia there is a monopoly of military power, limitless territories, or the special advantage for robbing the natives of China and others which partly supplements, partly takes the place of the monopoly of modern present day finance capital). Due to this difference for decades, England's monopoly *could* remain *unchallenged*. The monopoly of present-day finance capital is being hotly challenged; the epoch of imperialist wars has commenced. Formerly the working class of *one* country could be bribed, corrupted for decades. Now this is unlikely, even impossible, but on the other hand *every* imperialist "great" power, can and does bribe *smaller* (compared with England in 1848-68) sections of the "labour aristocracy." During that period, a "*bourgeois labour party*" according to the splendidly profound expression used by Engels, could be formed only in one country, because it alone enjoyed monopoly, but for that matter lasting for a long time. Now a "*bourgeois labour party*" is *unavoidable* and typical for *all* imperialist countries, but in view of their desperate struggle for the division of the booty, it is unlikely that such a Party could for long be victorious in a number of countries. For the *masses* of the proletariat and semi-proletariat are more and more crushed, oppressed, tortured and harried by the trusts, financial oligarchy and high prices, *which make it possible* to bribe a handful of their higher sections.

On the one hand, there is the tendency of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists, to turn a handful of the richest, privileged nations into "eternal" parasites on the body of the rest of humanity, "to rest on the laurels" of the exploitation of the Negroes, Indians, &c., keeping them in subjection with the assistance of the well-equipped destructive technique of modern militarism. On the other hand, the tendency of the *masses*, more oppressed than formerly and bearing all the tortures of imperialist wars, is to throw off that yoke, to overthrow the bourgeoisie. The history of the labour movement will from now on inevitably unfold itself in the struggle between these two tendencies. For the first tendency is not accidental, but has its economic "basis." The bourgeoisie has already begotten, nurtured and made sure of for itself, the "bourgeois labour parties" of the social chauvinists, in *all* countries. The difference, for instance, between the already formed party of Bissolati in Italy, a party wholly social-imperialist, and, let us say, a partially-formed semi-party, of the Potresovs, Gvozdevs, Bulkins, Chkheidzes, Skobelevs and Co.—is immaterial. The important thing is that the economic breaking away of a section of the labour aristocracy to the bourgeois, i.e., has developed and become completed, and whatever its political form, this economic fact, this shifting in the relations between the classes, can be found without special "effort."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On the economic basis indicated, the political institutions of modern capitalism—press, parliament, trade unions, congresses, &c., have created, corresponding to the economic privileges and bribes for respectful, meek, reformist and patriotic employees and workers, *political* privileges and bribes. Lucrative and peaceful berths in the ministries, or the war industry committees, in parliament and in various commissions, on the editorial staffs of " solid " legal newspapers, or in the administration of no less solid and " bourgeois-abiding " labour unions—this is how the imperialist bourgeoisie attracts and rewards the representatives and supporters of the " bourgeois labour parties."

The mechanics of political democracy act in the same direction. You *can't get on* without elections in our time. You cannot get along without the masses ; and in this period of the printing press and parliamentarism it is *impossible* to make the masses follow you without a widely ramified, systematically conducted, well-equipped system of flattery, lies, fraud, of juggling with fashionable and popular words, of promising right and left any kind of reforms, and *any* blessings to the workers, if only they will give up revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. I would call this system, Lloyd-Georgism, after one of the most advanced and slick representatives of this system in the classical country of the " bourgeois labour party," the English minister, Lloyd George. A first class bourgeois manipulator and political shark, a popular orator, able to deliver all sorts of speeches, even r-r-revolutionary speeches before a workers' audience, capable of giving considerable gifts to the obedient workers in the shape of social reforms (insurance, &c.), Lloyd George serves the bourgeoisie splendidly.[3] He serves the bourgeoisie precisely amongst the workers, transmits its influence *precisely* to the proletariat, there, where it is most needed and where it is most difficult of all to subordinate the masses morally to the bourgeoisie.

And is there a great difference between Lloyd George and the Scheidemanns, Legiens, Hendersons and Hyndmans, the Plekhanovs, Renaudels and Co. ? Some will argue that from the latter, some will return to the revolutionary socialism of Marx. This is possible, but it is an insignificant difference in degree, if we consider the question on a political, *i.e.*, mass scale. Individual figures from the present day social chauvinist leaders may return to the proletariat. But the social chauvinist *tendency* or (what amounts to the same thing) the opportunist tendency, neither disappears nor " returns " to the revolutionary proletariat. Wherever Marxism is popular amongst the workers, this political current, this " bourgeois labour party " will swear by the name of Marx. We

[3] Recently in an English journal I came across an article by a Tory, a political opponent of Lloyd George's, entitled " Lloyd George from the point of view of a Tory." The war had opened the eyes of this opponent to a realisation of what an excellent assistant of the bourgeoisie this Lloyd George is ! The Tories have made peace with him !

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot prevent them from doing this, just as it is impossible to prohibit a trading firm using any label, any sign, any advertisement. It has always happened in history, that after the death of revolutionary leaders popular amongst the oppressed classes, that their enemies attempted to utilise their names, for the deception of the oppressed classes.

The fact is, that " bourgeois labour parties " as a political phenomenon, have already formed themselves in *all* the advanced capitalist countries, that without a determined, merciless struggle all along the line, against these parties, or, it is the same thing, against groups, tendencies, &c., there can be no talk of a struggle against imperialism, or of Marxism, or of a socialist labour movement. Tchheidze's fraction, " Nashe Delo " (Our Cause), " The Voice of Labour " (Golos Truda), and the supporters of the Organising Committee[4] abroad, are nothing but varieties of one or the other of such parties. There is not the slightest reason to believe that these parties could disappear *before* the social revolution. On the contrary, the nearer the revolution, the more powerfully will it develop, the more sudden and violent the transitions and jumps from one stage to another in its process, the greater will be the struggle inside the labour movement, of the revolutionary mass stream against opportunist philistinism. Kautskianism represents no independent current, having no roots either in the masses or in the privileged section which went over to the bourgeoisie. The danger of Kautskianism is that, utilising the ideology of the past, it energetically attempts to reconcile the proletariat with the " bourgeois labour parties " to maintain their unity, and in this way raise the authority of the latter. Open social chauvinists are not followed by the masses any longer. Lloyd George was hissed at workers' meetings in England; Hyndman left the party; the Renaudels and Scheidmanns, Potresovs and Gvosdevs are protected by the police. The concealed defence of social chauvinism by the Kautskians is the most dangerous thing of all.

One of the most widely spread sophisms of Kautskianism consists in their references to the " masses." We do not want, they say, to break away from the masses and mass organisations. But consider how Engels approached this question. The " mass organisation " of the English trade unions in the nineteenth century were on the side of the bourgeois labour party. Marx and Engels did not reconcile themselves to it on these grounds, but exposed it. They did not forget (1) that the trade union organisations directly embraced a *minority of the proletariat*. In England then, as in Germany now, no more than one-fifth of the proletariat are members of organisations. One cannot seriously imagine that

[4] The Organising Committee formed inside the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party, arose as the leading organ of the August bloc of 1912, which was created by the menshevik fraction for struggle with the bolsheviks. The war divided its members amongst various tendencies of social-patriotism and " platonic internationalism," the representative of which was the Foreign Secretariat of the Organising Committee. [Ed.]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under capitalism it is possible to include in organisations the majority of the proletariat. Secondly, and this is the main point, it is not so much a question of how many members there are in an organisation, as what is the real objective meaning of its politics; whether these politics represent the masses, whether they serve the masses, *i.e.*, the liberation of the masses from capitalism, or whether it represents the interests of the minority, its conciliation with capitalism. It was specifically the latter which was true for England in the 19th century, and is true for Germany, &c., to-day.

Engels distinguishes between the "bourgeois labour party" of the *old* trade unions, a privileged minority, and the "*lowest* mass," the real majority. Engels appeals to the latter, which is *not* infected with "bourgeois respectability." This is the essence of Marxian tactics.

We cannot—nor can anybody, calculate before hand what section of the proletariat follows and will follow the social chauvinists and opportunists. Only the struggle will reveal this; it will be definitely decided only by the social revolution. But we know, quite undubitably, that the "defenders of the fatherland" in the imperialist war represent only a minority. It is our duty, therefore, if we wish to remain socialists, to go *lower* and *deeper* to the real masses; this is the meaning and the content of the struggle against opportunism. Exposing the fact that the opportunists and social chauvinists, in reality betray and sell out the interests of the masses, that they defend the temporary privileges of a minority of the workers, that they are transmitting bourgeois ideas and influence, that in practice they are allies and agents of the bourgeoisie, we, thereby teach the masses to recognise their real political interests, to fight for socialism and the revolution throughout all the long and painful vicissitudes of imperialist wars and imperialist armed truces.

To explain to the masses the inevitability and the necessity for breaking with opportunism, to educate them for the revolution by a merciless struggle with opportunism, to utilise the experiences of the war in order to unmask the whole repulsiveness of national liberal labour politics, and not to cover them up—that is the only Marxian line in the working class movement of the world.

In the next article we will endeavour to sum up the main distinguishing characteristics of this line as opposed to Kautskianism.[5]

[5] This article entitled "Disarmament" was printed for the first time in English in the August, 1930, issue of the LABOUR MONTHLY. Readers of this issue can obtain copies of that number at the specially reduced price of 4d. per copy, post free, if application is made to the Manager before March 1st.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

A TYPICAL BRITISH VICEROY

Indian Problems : Speeches by Lord Irwin. (Allen & Unwin.) 376 pp. 12s. 6d.

WHY anyone should think fit to reprint the collection of the speeches of a British Viceroy in India is a wonder, but when that experiment is made with not a first-rate mentality like Lord Irwin, one has to wonder more. We are assured that "the Editor of this volume of Lord Irwin's speeches wishes to remain anonymous."

These are all State speeches, made on State occasions. The largest number of these speeches are delivered before the legislators at Delhi, something like the "King's Speech" at the opening of British Parliaments. Here comes in the first great difference: the British Premier, with a packed Party vote behind him, tells His Majesty's Commons what measures he will place before Parliament "for consideration," and acceptance or rejection, as if ever his pledged Party pups would dare to think or to reject a Government measure. In India the Viceroy does not need even this window-dressing of "Parliamentary democracy," there he simply tells the legislators how he proposes to govern the legislators as well as the country. So he need not say much, nor surely dare he produce any reasoned arguments or intellectual statement of policy.

Here is a book which in itself gives you the evidence of the first curse of foreign imposed rule on India, namely, how a person whose mental accomplishments do not rank in the first-class category, who can do little at home to shine in any walk of life in his merit, can with insolence go abroad to rule hundreds of millions of people, most of whom are of better calibre than himself.

From the first page to the last this book is full of pompous nonsense, delivered in the right regal style.

Agriculture was supposed to be the strong point of Irwin. Through a series of commissions, conferences, and speeches, all that Irwin has been able to *do* for India, is to admonish the people of India that "scientific research is the life-blood of economic progress." That is all. The book is ambitiously called *Indian Problems*, but Irwin's speeches have not a word about India's real problems. No one knows why he kept 92 per cent. of India's population in illiteracy and ignorance, why he kept 97 per cent. grovelling in miserable poverty with an average earning of 4d. a day per head, why the heavy death-rate, why the franchise restricted to 5 per cent. and the rest 95 per cent. kept as political serfs. He has said not a word about Meerut prisoners, though he has ejaculated a pious horror against Communism now and again. He has not explained if ever, and why, he held 100,000 Indians as political prisoners, and why he got people shot in Sholapur, Lahore, Madras, Chittagong, Tharawadi or Peshawar. Not a word about Gharwalli troops nor the murderous British air-raids—no fewer than 1,154—over Afridi villages.

From 1926 to 1931 he has kept Indian legislators filled with hopes about the future further rewards that would come to the Princes, landlords, merchants and professional politicians through the channels of Simon Commission and Round-Table Conference with a series of "buts" and "if" attached to the same.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The author has preferred to remain concealed, but he appears to be one of the Gandhi cult, judging by various books on Gandhism advertised on the cover of this book. So here we have the moral. A Gandhi who tells the persecuted and oppressed people of India never to exercise violence or counter-violence even in word or thought against British Imperialism, and an Irwin who has maintained British Imperialism by daily imprisonment, and periodical bombing, shooting and batoning of men, women and even children, are held up to us as twin-brothers and apostles who are trying to convince the masses of India of the blessings of Capitalism and great hopes in Parliamentary reformism. Not a bad pair of Himalayan failures!

SH. S.

TRADE UNIONS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Trade Unions under Socialism. R.I.L.U. Publications. 3d.

THIS is a book which should be read by every trade union member in this country. It contains the speech made by J. Shvernik, Secretary of the Central Council of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, to the Eighth Session of the Central Council of the Red International of Labour Unions (R.I.L.U.) which met in Moscow in December, 1931.

It is an excellent summary of the activity of the trade unions in the Soviet Union, commencing with the keynote that—

> The whole activities of the Soviet Trade Unions are inseparably connected with the struggle for Socialist Construction in the U.S.S.R.

Here we have in a nutshell the fundamental difference between the trade unions in a country where the workers are the rulers, and the trade unions in capitalist countries. Instead of grandiose schemes for the restoration of capitalism, such as were put forward by the General Council at the Newcastle Trades Union Congress, the central theme throughout this pamphlet is the leading part played by the trade unions in carrying through the Five Year Plan of Socialist Construction. Instead of schemes of capitalist rationalisation which reduce wages and increase unemployment, it shows how the Soviet trade unions help to plan production and reduce costs, not at the expense of the worker, but to increase wages and leisure, and draw millions more into industry.

In the past two years the trade unions of the Soviet Union have been reorganised in order to bring them closer to the workers in the factories and to play a more effective part in socialist industrialisation. The reformist leaders in the capitalist countries declare this to be a return to the craft principle in union structure. It is nothing of the kind. For instance, the Miners' Union is divided into four—Ore Miners' Union; Coal Miners' Union; Oil Workers' Union; Slate and Peat Workers' Union. The fundamental principle is that of "one factory one union." This is not merely an abstract principle, but the most effective method of participating in the carrying out of the Five Year Plan.

The Soviet Trade Unions are not bothered with problems of unemployment benefit to their members. On the contrary, one of their most important functions is to organise the "recruiting of labour power on the basis of concluding agreements between the factories and the collective farms." This is shown in the increasing membership of the trade unions. In 1925 there were 10½ million members, 12,065,000 members in 1930, 15 million members in October, 1931, and this year the membership is over 17 million—which is more than the total membership of the reformist trade unions throughout Europe.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This pamphlet shows why it was necessary to combat the equalising tendency in wages between heavy and light industries, and that wages policy must be based " not only on the moral, but on the complete totality of the material and economic conditions which interest the workers, in raising their productivity and their skill." This is a process of levelling up wages, and not reducing wages of skilled workers as in capitalist countries. This in itself is a complete refutation of the reformist lies and slanders. The wages fund in the Soviet Union in 1930 was 13,350 million roubles, in 1931 the Five Year Plan provided for a wage fund of 15,650 million roubles, but the actual wage fund paid out was 21,100 million roubles. For 1932 it was planned to bring the wage fund up to 26,800 million roubles. It is interesting to contrast the miners of this country whose wages were reduced last year by over £40,000 per week, with the miners in the Soviet Union whose wages were planned to be 98.50 roubles per month, but actually totalled 119 roubles per month.

Of particular importance is the section on the election of the factory committees which check up the activities of the trade union organisations. Examples are given of the proposals made by these committees and how they exercise control in the factories and over the trade unions. When Mr. Cramp trotted out the old lie at the Leicester Labour Party Conference that there was no workers' control in the Soviet Union, possibly he was not aware of these facts. Or was it that he was so horrified at the proposal for similar control in this country, that he had no option but to rely on lies and slander ?

Finally, there is an interesting section towards the end showing how experiences in the Soviet Union can help the work of the revolutionary trade unions in the capitalist countries and the activities of the revolutionary opposition. This pamphlet should be in the hands of every worker. It is fully worth the price.

D. R.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

History of the Russian Revolution. Vols. I., II. and III. L. Trotsky. (Victor Gollancz.) 18s. each.

People's Year Book. Co-operative Wholesale Society. 350 pp. 3s.

Occupational Misfits. Sheila Bevington. (Allen & Unwin.) 102 pp. 6s.

Twelve Studies in Soviet Russia. New Fabian Research Bureau. (Victor Gollancz.) 282 pp. 5s.

The State and Revolution. N. Lenin. Translated into Hindustani. Ganashakti Publishing House, Room 25, 41 Zakariah Street, Calcutta, India.

Britain's Peril. R. C. Smart. (London General Press.) 112 pp. 3s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED